

Volume IX. OCTOBER, 1910. Number 4

The
South Atlantic Quarterly.

The English Constitutional Crisis.

WILLIAM THOMAS LAPRADE

Assistant Professor of History in Trinity College.

England is at this moment in the midst of a serious crisis. The point in dispute is generally described as the "constitutional question." But it is almost as difficult for an observer to make out the thing really at issue as Kaspar found it to tell Peterkin what they killed each other for at Blenheim. If we accept Mr. Asquith's recent resolutions at their face value, the question is whether the right of veto shall be taken away from the House of Lords. Others, who by no means hold similar views, contend that the real problem is the reformation of the second chamber. To some, who look beneath the surface, the rejection by "the other place" of several important proposals of the Liberal party, culminating in the election of January, 1910 on the financial proposals of Mr. David Lloyd George, seems to have occasioned the present disturbance. Another class of observers insist that the mooted point is whether England shall change her policy of more than sixty years and return to a system of protective tariffs. Finally, underground rumblings from the secret sessions of the conference which is supposed to have the whole matter under consideration seem to indicate that Irish home rule, and even an imperial federation, may somehow grow out of the present controversy. The purpose of this article is to enquire how all these things came to be involved in the question which might ere this have been put to the British electorate but for the death of Edward VII.

One of the chief difficulties is to fix upon the proper point with which to begin the story. The question of the relations between the two houses of Parliament is by no means new, and Lord Roseberry was not the first to suggest a reformation in the House of Lords. Moreover, in view of William of Normandy's celebrated performance, few will accuse Mr. Lloyd George—to use

the name by which the Chancellor of the Exchequer is generally known, though he is said to prefer the name George only—of proposing an entirely new thing in bringing forward his scheme of land valuation. However, though we do not go so far back as 1085, if we are to understand the powers behind the Budget of 1909-1910 it is important to have some knowledge of the British naval program and the solid results of the propaganda in favor of that very flexible doctrine called "social reform." And to discuss intelligently the present wide-spread agitation in favor of "Tariff Reform" we must go back at least as far as 1903, when Mr. Chamberlain played the witch to call up what has proved to be a very lively ghost of an old English policy. That, in turn, makes it necessary for us to have some understanding of the colonial situation which was the basal motive of the Colonial Secretary's proposals at that time, and which has contributed so largely to lend strength to the movement which he inaugurated. Imperial federation is merely another solution for this same colonial problem, involving also an attempt to cure certain long standing ills of the British government itself. However, the difficulty is not so much to know where to begin a discussion of any one of these questions by itself, as to decide how they ought to be brought together within the limits of an article of this kind so as to contribute their share in explaining the situation in which Great Britain finds herself in the autumn of 1910.

Since the British government is as yet preeminently a government of parties, perhaps a glance at the manner in which the present representatives of the people are grouped will be an enlightening preface to what we shall have to say as we go on. Theoretically, a modern House of Commons is supposed to be divided into the "Government" or "Administration" and the "Opposition," whatever may be the party names or shibboleths of the two divisions. The members of the administration party sit on the right of the Speaker and give their votes for the measures and policies formulated by the inner coterie known as the Cabinet, who, under the leadership of the Prime Minister, control the executive government of the empire. Those who occupy the benches to the Speaker's left make it their chief business to criticize and vote against the measures of the party opposite, also under the leadership and direction of those who occupy their

front bench and who look forward to having a share in the government when a majority of the house enables them to go over to the administration side. This, at least, was true in a measure till January, 1910. The House of Commons has been for the most part a two-party body as contrasted with the more numerous divisions in the legislatures of Continental nations. Of course there have been third and even fourth parties, but the administration, with several exceptions, has had a compact majority for the past third of a century. The disintegration which occurred last January is worthy of notice since even the present leader of the opposition, Mr. Balfour, seems to think it has come to stay.

Briefly, the present situation came about as follows. In the first years of the Parliament of 1868 there were only two parties in the House of Commons, Conservative and Liberal, though the latter was composed of a Whig and a Radical branch. The question of home rule for Ireland caused a realignment, and in the Parliament of 1886 there were 316 Conservatives, 192 Liberals or followers of Gladstone, 77 Liberal Unionists, former Liberals who were opposed to Home Rule, and 85 Irish Nationalists, who were under the leadership of Parnell. Before the election of 1892 the Nationalists had divided. Fifty members revolted from Parnell, while the remainder continued to act under his leadership in advocating a more radical form of Home Rule. On the death of Parnell in 1891 Mr. John Redmond, who is still at the head of the party, assumed the mantle of the deceased leader. As a result of the election of 1892 there were returned to Parliament 268 Conservatives, 275 Liberals, 46 Liberal Unionists, and 81 Nationalists and Parnellites. This enabled the combined advocates of Home Rule to form an administration which existed, first under Gladstone and then under Lord Roseberry, until 1894, when they were defeated in the House and were succeeded by a Conservative and Liberal Unionist ministry under Lord Salisbury. The election of 1895 established the Conservatives more firmly in power since they returned 340 members against 177 Liberals, 71 Liberal Unionists, and 82 Nationalists and Parnellites. In January, 1900 the two wings of the Irish party reunited under the leadership of Mr. Redmond. But for the time being Home Rule ceased to have the center of the stage, and the

most prominent issue in the general election of 1900 was the war in South Africa then being conducted by the administration. On this question the Liberals did not entirely agree among themselves. One branch of the party, prominent among whom was Mr. Lloyd George, denounced the war as "a crime and a blunder committed at the instigation of irresponsible capitalists." The more moderate Liberals merely criticized the methods of the government, but were "impressed with the duty of maintaining our free, unaggressive and tolerant empire abroad." The returns showed that in the new Parliament the Conservatives would have 334 members, the Liberals 186, the Liberal Unionists 68, and the Nationalists 82.

In 1902 Lord Salisbury resigned and was succeeded as Prime Minister by Mr. A. J. Balfour. The next year Mr. Joseph Chamberlain announced his policy of Tariff Reform which has since played such an important rôle in English politics. The proposals of the Colonial Secretary were endorsed by the Prime Minister, but in language which betrayed little heartiness. Other members of the Cabinet warmly approved of them, while still others objected to them outright. The result was that in September, 1903 Mr. Chamberlain resigned office to carry on a propaganda in favor of his views. Not knowing of the intention of the Colonial Secretary, several members of the Cabinet who opposed his views had already resigned. Mr. Balfour continued extremely lukewarm in his support of the Chamberlain policies, and in November, 1905 went so far as to say in a public speech that he never had been and was not then on the "Protectionist side." He was, therefore, clearly not in sympathy with those who had overstepped Mr. Chamberlain's scheme of "Colonial Preference," and were advocating outright the adoption of a general protective tariff. In the meantime the bye-elections had consistently gone against the administration till by the end of November, 1905 the House stood: 311 Conservatives, 58 Liberal Unionists, 288 Liberals, and 82 Nationalists. In December of the same year Mr. Balfour resigned, and a government was formed under Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.

In the general election of 1906 the question of free trade entirely overshadowed Home Rule, and the verdict of the country was overwhelmingly against Mr. Chamberlain. A feature of

the election was the rise of a new party whose members in Parliament are paid salaries by various labor organizations, and whose efforts are presumably devoted to securing the interests of working men. Its members are pledged to abstain from identifying themselves with, or promoting the interest of, any section of either of the old parties. But in the new Parliament the Liberals had no need of the assistance of another party in the House of Commons, since they had 376 members. The remaining members were distributed, 83 to the Nationalists, 53 to the Labor party, and 158 to the other parties now united under the common name of Unionists.

The defeat of 1906 by no means put an end to the agitation in favor of Tariff Reform. An active propaganda was kept up by the disciples of Mr. Chamberlain. That gentleman himself, in a correspondence with Mr. Balfour in the winter of 1906, succeeded in getting the former Prime Minister to commit himself, somewhat hazily it must be confessed, in the following statement: "I hold that fiscal reform is, and must remain, the first constructive work of the Unionist party. That the objects of such reform are to secure more equal terms of competition for British trade and closer commercial union with the colonies. That while it is at present unnecessary to prescribe the exact methods by which these objects are to be attained, and inexpedient to permit differences of opinion as to these methods to divide the party, though other means may be possible, the establishment of a moderate general tariff on manufactured goods not imposed for the purpose of raising prices or giving artificial protection against legitimate competition, and the imposition of a small duty on foreign corn are not in principle objectionable, and should be adopted if shown to be necessary for the attainment of the ends in view or for the purposes of revenue." It is clear from Mr. Balfour's speech on the subject a few days before the recess of Parliament that this statement still approximates his views. On the other hand, many members of his party openly advocate protection on the ground that Great Britain ought to pursue the same policy as her rivals in protecting home industries.

That the election of January, 1910 did not turn primarily on the question of Tariff Reform was due to the Budget which the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed in his speech of April 29,

1909. The Liberal party had complied with its promises of social reform by inaugurating a system of old age pensions. Calls came from both sides of the house for a more extensive naval program in order to keep pace with Germany in her struggle for supremacy. Largely as a result for these two items Mr. Lloyd George found himself called upon to meet an anticipated deficit of £15,000,000. In order to do this he proposed numerous increases in old taxes, and some new ones. Some of the more important of his proposals were an increase in the liquor and license taxes, increases in various income taxes with a super-tax of sixpence in the pound on incomes over £5,000, and a tax on the unearned increment of land values. In order to have a basis for the tax on the "site value" of land, he also proposed a sort of new "Domesday Book," or a reassessment of the land in the kingdom for the purpose of ascertaining its value apart from present rental returns.

As might have been expected, such a decided increase in taxation aroused opposition in the various quarters where the additional burdens would be most strongly felt. The Irish were opposed to the whiskey tax as a hardship on one of their industries. The Unionists had other reasons to be strenuous in their opposition. Being committed to the policy of Tariff Reform, the disciples of Mr. Chamberlain naturally argued that the necessary additional revenue might be raised more advantageously to the country by taxes on imports. Then, too, the increased taxes on incomes and the land taxes are felt more keenly by the members of the party which has among its adherents a majority of the landholding and wealthier classes. In spite of this strong opposition, however, the large Liberal majority were able after a long debate to carry the Budget through the House of Commons, only to find themselves obliged to appeal to the country in December, 1909 after it had been rejected by the House of Lords. This action of their Lordships, in addition to Tariff Reform and the Budget, thrust a third prominent issue into the general election which followed in January.

However, this was far from being a new question to English politics. We do not have to go back many years to find Gladstone and John Bright making speeches which sound strikingly familiar to one who has followed the discussions that accom-

panied and have followed the Budget controversy of last winter. Nor was this the first trick of the kind which the House of Lords had played on the Liberals in more recent years. One of the tasks undertaken by Campbell-Bannerman in the new Parliament in 1906 was the reform of the complex, antiquated system under which public education is carried on in England and Wales. His bill came back from the upper house with amendments which practically defeated the purposes of its framers. As a result, in the king's speech at the opening of the session in 1907 the Prime Minister called attention to the "differences between the two Houses." On June 24 he moved: "That, in order to give effect to the will of the people, as expressed by their elected representatives, it is necessary that the power of the other House to alter or reject bills passed by this House should be so restricted by law as to secure that within the limits of a single Parliament the final decision of the Commons shall prevail." This resolution was easily carried by an overwhelming majority. But in the upper house it only resulted in the appointment of a select committee to consider "suggestions made for increasing the efficiency of the House in matters of legislation."

In April, 1908 Campbell-Bannerman resigned office on account of illness, and Mr. Herbert Henry Asquith formed a new administration. His Cabinet included several of the younger members of the party who were warm advocates of the Liberal policies of social reform. One of the most important measures brought forward that year was the "Licensing Bill," which Mr. Asquith introduced in February while he was Chancellor of the Exchequer before his accession to the premiership. The desired object was a decrease in the number of licensed houses and a general reform in the conditions attending the conduct of places for the sale of liquor. The bill was passed in November, 1908 only to be thrown out by the Lords. Consequently the question of the veto power of the upper house was discussed again in the debate on the king's speech at the opening of the session of 1909, but was subordinated to the financial program of the ministry which Mr. Asquith said "demanded first attention." Everybody is familiar with the result. When the Budget of 1909 was sent upstairs Lord Lansdowne moved on November 16: "That this House is not justified in giving its consent to this Bill until it has been submitted to

the judgment of the country." The adoption of this resolution did more than merely add another count to the Liberal indictment of the House of Lords as an obstruction to the popular will. By effectually rejecting a financial measure which had passed the lower house the peers revived a dispute which had been quiet since the seventeenth century and which writers on the English constitution had been accustomed to regard as settled.

In view of these facts it is no easy matter to decide what was the chief issue in the general election of January, 1910. It is quite as difficult to ascertain what questions were settled as a result of that election. Mr. Balfour wittily said: "The election itself was no doubt primarily on the Budget, and on the Budget the country has pronounced. I am not quite sure what it has pronounced, but, at all events, it has pronounced, and when, as I myself anticipate, it receives a somewhat chilly but yet numerically adequate support in this House, without doubt it will become a law." This prophecy was fulfilled. The Budget was introduced and passed. But we cannot dismiss the issues in the election so easily. The administration, it is true, professed to fight its battle primarily in favor of the "people's Budget." But it was also a battle against the House of Lords which had rejected that Budget. Mr. Asquith, by making a sort of promise to support the efforts of the Irish to secure home rule in purely local affairs, in his Albert Hall speech on December 10, introduced another issue which was no doubt useful to the followers of Mr. Redmond. The Unionist party, on the other hand, strenuously opposed the Budget, and defended to a certain extent the veto power of the House of Lords. But the substitute which they offered for the Budget, and which was really the positive issue on which they based their claims for support, was a system of tariffs on imports.

In view of this plethora of issues we do not wonder that Mr. Balfour was not certain what the people had pronounced. However, by looking a little beneath the surface of the election returns we may at least find out one or two things which the country did not pronounce. In the new Parliament the Liberals have 275 members, the Unionists 273, the Labor party 40, and the Nationals 82. Therefore the Liberals depend for their majority on

the support of the Laborites and the Irish. As compared with the Parliament of 1906, there were manifestly large Unionist gains. The question is, aside from a natural swing of the political pendulum, on what issues these gains were made. Some light is thrown on this subject by the location of the new Unionist constituencies. In the counties the Unionists returned 144 members in 1910 against 76 in 1906, while in the boroughs outside of London they returned 120 in 1910 against 72 in 1906. It appears, therefore, that Unionist gains were heavier in districts in which a rural population predominates. A still closer examination further emphasizes the fact that the large Liberal losses were in the agricultural sections. In Lancashire and Yorkshire, counties in which manufacturing is the principal industry, the Unionists made a net gain of only three members out of a total of 109. On the other hand, they carried Kent, Surry, Sussex, Hertfordshire, and Huntingdon, which are predominantly agricultural counties, without a single reverse. In 1906 these counties elected twelve Liberals out of a total of twenty-six members. It is also clear from the poll that the Unionist gains were not due entirely to Liberal losses. This was doubtless because of a greater interest in the contest which occasioned a fuller attendance of the electorate and also caused those entitled to plural suffrage to exert themselves to take advantage of their privileges. The interests of the latter class of voters would naturally tend to make them opponents of the Budget proposals. It seems tolerably certain, therefore, that the Unionist gains in the election of January, 1910 were due in larger measure to that party's opposition to the financial proposals of the government than to the progress it had made with its positive propaganda in favor of Tariff Reform.

However, there is no question but that the proposals of Mr. Chamberlain have increased much in popular favor since 1906. A party so persistent in its efforts, beginning with such a considerable nucleus, must necessarily have gained recruits. The "Tariff Reform League," which is the active organization of the propaganda, certainly does not seem to lack financial assistance, and it is supported in its efforts by a large majority of the most respectable publications of the newspaper and periodical press. Indeed, judging from that criterion, the wonder is not that the

Unionists made gains in 1910, but that they did not elect an overwhelming majority in the new Parliament. Yet, aside from the actual character of the returns which we have pointed out, it seems very doubtful from the nature of the case whether the followers of Mr. Balfour could make as good showing with Tariff Reform as the primary issue as they did in their fight against the Budget. Mr. Asquith touched the crux of the matter in a question which he asked the Unionist leader in a recent debate. Mr. Balfour had utilized the last opportunity of the session to make one of his speeches in favor of "Colonial Preference," which are said to keep his colleagues in constant fear as long as he is on his feet that he will betray the cause. When he had concluded the Prime Minister laconically queried: "Are you going to put a tax on corn?" This question points to a world of difficulty. There are and must continue to be a great many more consumers than producers of grain in England. In such a population a tariff on food is not likely to conduce to the popularity of the party which imposes it. Yet the cardinal doctrine of the protectionists is that their program will bind the colonies more closely to the mother country by ties of interest. And it is difficult to see how this end could be accomplished without giving the grain growers of Canada the same favors as would be bestowed upon the Australian producers of wool. Any other procedure would be a kind of colonial preference little calculated to bind the members of the empire together. Another argument adduced in favor of Tariff Reform is that it will foster a yeoman or agricultural class in England. We have just seen that the party which stands for that program was in the last election strongest in the agricultural districts. This party could ill afford, therefore, to protect the manufacturers without granting the same privileges to the workers of the soil. For all that, Mr. Asquith's question remains a knotty one for a party which expects the support of the British electorate.

However, the agitation goes on. The Tariff Reform League, among its other activities, is just now busy sending squads of British workingmen to Germany in order that they may learn by observation that protection is not the horrible thing Liberal orators have led them to suppose. Of course the men chosen to make the trips, the men in charge of them on the journey, and

the places visited are selected with a view of serving the purposes of the organization which defrays the expense. The results have been some amusing disputes as to whether horse-flesh is consumed as extensively in the Fatherland as some free trade campaign orators had asserted, or whether "black bread" is a staple diet for working men or a delicacy found only on the best tables. In addition to these contributions to the gaiety of the nation the Tariff Reform League has given a number of worthy persons the pleasure of a trip which they could not, perhaps, have afforded otherwise. Naturally there can have been no sufficiently tangible results to remunerate the Reformers for their expenditure. However, the League is as busy with speakers in every part of the United Kingdom as it is with the press, and certainly seems to be doing all that could be expected of it to bring its cause to a successful issue.

Yet it does not seem likely that the labor of the Tariff Reformers will find its fruition in the next election. When the new Parliament met after the election in January Mr. Asquith was obliged to seek support from the Nationalists. The Irish were, as a matter of fact, opposed to the Budget because of the increased tax on whiskey. However, the avowed purpose of their organization is to secure self-government for Ireland, and it is manifest that there is little likelihood of carrying such a measure through the House of Lords in its present status. Therefore Mr. Redmond agreed that his party would support the Budget provided the administration would first commit itself in some definite manner to deal with the second chamber. Pursuant to this agreement, the Prime Minister on March 29 moved that the House resolve itself into a committee to consider the "relation between the House of Parliament and the question of the duration of Parliament." The three resolutions which he introduced into the Committee were passed by the middle of April and sent to the House of Lords. In effect the first of these resolutions provided that the House of Lords ought to be disabled by law from "rejecting and amending a Money Bill." It was to be left to the Speaker to decide whether a given measure was in the definition of the resolution a money bill. The second resolution provided that the power of the House of Lords respecting other than money bills ought to be "restricted by Law, so that any such Bill which has

passed the House of Commons in three successive sessions and, having been sent up to the House of Lords at least one month before the end of the session, has been rejected by that House in each of those sessions, shall become a Law without the consent of the House of Lords on the Royal Assent being declared." However, two years must have elapsed between the introduction of such a bill and its passage for a third time by the Commons. The Lords were to be regarded as having rejected a bill unless they had passed it without amendments objectionable to the lower house. The third resolution merely provided that the duration of Parliaments ought to be limited to five years instead of seven as the case is now, which change would ensure a new election every four years. When the House of Commons had passed these resolutions and had given leave to bring in a bill embodying them, the Budget was disposed of in the course of the next week.

When Mr. Asquith introduced his Parliament Bill on April 14, he said: "If the Lords fail to accept our policy, or decline to consider it as it is formally presented to the House, we shall feel it our duty immediately to tender advice to the Crown as to the steps which will have to be taken if that policy is to receive statutory effect in this Parliament. What the precise terms of that advice will be it will, of course, not be right for me to say now; but if we do not find ourselves in a position to ensure that statutory effect will be given to that policy in this Parliament, we shall then either resign our offices or recommend the dissolution of Parliament. Let me add this, that in no case will we recommend a dissolution except under such conditions as will secure that in the new Parliament the judgment of the people as expressed at the election will be carried out." This statement was understood to mean that if the government should be able to command the support of the people for their proposals, the House of Lords would be overawed with the same club which brought them to terms in 1832. When Parliament adjourned on April 28 to meet on May 26, everybody imagined that the question would be submitted to the people in the summer. The Prime Minister sailed for southern Europe to refresh himself for the coming contest. The death of the king recalled him before he had reached his destination and caused a complete change in the immediate political situation.

Parliament assembled, as the law requires, on May 7, immediately after the death of Edward VII was announced. Both sides recognized that there must necessarily be a truce in the constitutional controversy. The House of Lords itself, when it adjourned, had been considering resolutions looking toward a reform in that body. Indeed, it had already voted that an hereditary peerage ought not necessarily to entitle its holder to a seat in the house. But these resolutions were now withdrawn, and at the suggestion of the new king it was decided to use the time of truce in an effort to settle the points at issue by compromise. Accordingly the administration invited representatives of the opposition to a conference. This conference is composed of Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Birrell, and Lord Crewe on the part of government, and Mr. Balfour, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Lord Lansdowne, and Lord Cawdor on the part of the Unionists. Up to the adjournment of Parliament for the summer recess the conference had held twelve secret sessions, and the Prime Minister announced at that time that, while no agreement had been reached, sufficient progress had been made to warrant a continuance of the discussions.

The parties to the conference hold radically different views with respect to the question which they are called upon to discuss. The administration members are in a measure bound by Mr. Asquith's resolutions. There has even been a tendency on the part of some of the more radical supporters of this view to become impatient at the delay which the conference involves, since, according to their contention, the only possible question for their leaders is whether the Unionists will accede to the veto resolutions. However, the party speakers and newspaper writers are preparing their adherents for concessions by showing the manifest absurdity of a conference unless both parties are ready to yield something. However, they are careful to maintain that the result to be acceptable must secure the Liberal contentions. The resolutions themselves, we have seen, were designed to deprive the House of Lords of any share whatever in legislation except the privilege of delaying for two years certain kinds of measures. The Unionists, on the other hand, contend that what is needed is not a weakening of the powers of the second chamber but a reform of that house itself. They argue that a strong second chamber is a desir-

able element in the English constitution, and are not in favor of reducing the legislature to a uni-cameral system, which would practically be the result should Mr. Asquith's resolutions become law.

The Liberal grievance against the House of Lords as that body is at present constituted is a real and serious one. Liberals argue, not without reason, that it does not serve the purpose for which a second chamber is desirable, but is purely an asset of the Unionist party and is at Mr. Balfour's service at any time he chooses to make use of it. The events of the last twenty years certainly seem to substantiate this contention. As long as there was a Conservative or Unionist Ministry the voice of the Lords was not heard on any matter of importance. The will of the majority in the lower house was law. On the accession of a Liberal administration their Lordships again became active, and at any time the Unionist leader pleases he can have the measures of the government thrown out or reduce his opponent to the necessity of a general election. It is manifest that such a situation will have to be remedied if any party besides that favored by the House of Lords is to conduct the government successfully. How this is to be done is the question with which the conference is supposed to be occupied.

While the conference was holding the dozen meetings which have already taken place Parliament, in addition to routine business, was discussing two other questions of constitutional significance. Neither of these, however, was a party measure, and both were therefore peculiarly suitable for the attention of the house in a time of political truce. Before these measures were disposed of, the Chancellor of the Exchequer made his Budget statement for the year. It differed very little from the one which the Lords rejected in 1909 and even, to the disgust of the Irish, retained the whiskey tax. This tax had failed as a revenue producer, but Mr. Lloyd George defended it on the ground that it had resulted in a decreased sale of intoxicants. But the proposals which had created a furor the year before were now "hum drum," and gave rise to little discussion except the perfunctory opposition inevitable from the other side of the house.

The first of the constitutional questions, as in fact was intended, did not get further than a full dress debate. Mr. Shackleton brought forward a bill giving women who now have the suf-

frage in municipal elections the right to vote for members of Parliament as well. The result of its passage, though it was designed by its friends as an opening wedge for universal suffrage, would have been to add to the electorate an element which would have had a decided conservative tendency. Having obtained from the Speaker a ruling that the bill as introduced was not susceptible of amendment to give it a more extensive application, the members of the Cabinet who favored woman's suffrage opposed this bill. Mr. Asquith himself, while opposed to female suffrage, gave the time in the house for its discussion on the ground that the subject was arousing the interest of the people and therefore deserved public consideration in Parliament. Mr. Balfour, on the other hand, spoke in favor of the measure and against several of his most prominent party colleagues. The result was that the bill passed its second reading and was referred to a committee of the whole house, where it will probably wait in vain for further consideration.

The second constitutional measure discussed in Parliament in the summer was a favor long due to the Irish and British Catholics in general. It is said that it was also a source of personal gratification to the king. Hitherto, since the religious settlements in the latter part of the seventeenth century, the sovereign on accession to the throne has been obliged to make a declaration abjuring expressly certain doctrines of the Roman Catholic church, and further to declare that he has no dispensation from the Pope to swear falsely. Catholics naturally object to having their religion singled from among the many professed by his subjects for special denunciation by the king at the time of his accession. The whole ceremony is useless, since it does not now take place until the time of the formal coronation, a year or more after the beginning of the reign, and since the Protestant succession is secured by act of Parliament. But custom demands a declaration of some sort, and Mr. Asquith attempted to formulate one which was unobjectionable. As introduced, his measure provided that the king should declare himself a member of the Protestant church "by Law established in England." This phrase raised objections from the high churchmen who disliked the idea of calling the English church protestant. The Dissenters were as little pleased, since they saw no reason why the king should

necessarily be a member of the Church of England. The result is that George V will merely declare himself a "faithful Protestant," to the satisfaction of all parties except a hand full of irreconcilables who are still as much afraid of the Catholics as George III after his insanity in the early years of the last century.

Having disposed of these things Parliament adjourned to meet November 15. At that time the Budget measures will have to be voted upon, and the conference will be expected to report the result of its discussions. It is not unlikely that the vote of the Irish party on the Budget may depend somewhat on the findings of the conference. Therefore the autumn session bids fair to be as interesting as either of the other two of the year. What will the mysterious eight have to report? Many suggestions have been published and discussed with more or less favor. The problem is how a deadlock between the two houses shall be broken without the necessity of an appeal to the people. Some form of a conference with members from both houses is probably the scheme most frequently proposed. Yet nothing of that kind has been suggested on which there is any decided agreement or which has received very general support.

There have, indeed, been persistent rumors that somehow or other Irish home rule will be involved in whatever agreement the conference reaches. Since the meetings of that body are secret, however, too much weight ought not to be attached to such rumors. The only straw which has come to the surface that seems to throw the least light on the situation is a speech made by Mr. Birrell, a member of the conference, before the "Eighty Club" on July 25. But the Chief Secretary for Ireland has contributed a verb to the language which is regularly printed in English papers with a lower case *b*. And when you "birrell" you are not always serious nor do you intend yourself to be taken seriously.

However, this speech, which was said to have been carefully prepared, was generally discussed at the time and certainly opens up larger vistas than many people had hitherto imagined as likely to result from the present discussions. The general idea he threw out was home rule in local matters for every division of the British Isles, with a general Parliament to deal with imperial questions. To this imperial legislature the colonies are to

be permitted to send representatives whenever of their own volition they decide to do so.

On the face of it there is certainly much in favor of such a settlement. If the colonies should send representatives to an imperial senate it would naturally cause the colonials to have greater interest in imperial concerns and would thus bind the empire together. Again, the British Isles have for a long time carried an almost overwhelming burden for the most of which the colonies are responsible. There does not seem to be any injustice in Australia's helping to build and maintain a navy which is kept for her defence. Yet the mother country can never receive dependable assistance for this purpose from the colonies till they have a share in the control of imperial affairs.

On the other hand, the difficulties in the way of giving immediate effect to such proposals make it extremely doubtful that Mr. Asquith will hazard the almost certain confusion which would result from recommending them. There is, for example, the very delicate question of India, which could certainly not come in on the same basis as the colonies. Then, too, the English public has not been educated up to such a radical change. It would be acceptable in Ireland, and an agitation since Mr. Birrell's speech would lead to the conclusion that it would not be unacceptable to Scotland. But it would be contrary to the entire past of England to conclude that she will suddenly embark on a sea as unknown as imperial federation. The more you think of it apart from actual conditions in the southern division of the island the more feasible and beneficial such a measure appears. But when you take account of the historic and perhaps beneficial conservatism which has usually pervaded even her most radical reforms, it is difficult to conceive of England, without a long campaign of preparation, making any such far reaching change in the government of the empire which she has built up and which she has hitherto dominated.

Judge Martin's Version of the Mecklenburg Declaration

By SAMUEL A. ASHE,

Editor of the Biographical History of North Carolina.—Author of a History of North Carolina, Etc.

There was cherished among the people of Mecklenburg county a tradition and memory of "that glorious transaction," the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, of which the manuscript record was in the possession of Col. John McKnitt Alexander. About the year 1787 Col. Alexander made a copy of this record and sent it to Dr. Hugh Williamson. In April, 1800 the Colonel's residence was destroyed by fire and this historic record was burnt. Subsequently Col. Alexander made some notes with the view of perpetuating some memorial of the burnt record. These notes, constituting Col. Alexander's personal statement of the matters contained in them, are as follows:

"On the 19th of May 1775, Pursuant to the Order of Col. Adam Alexander to each Captain of militia in his regiment of Mecklenburg County, to elect, nominate and appoint two persons of this militia company, cloathed with ample powers to devise ways and means to extricate themselves and ward off the dreadfull impending storm bursting on them by the British Nation etc.

Therefore on s^d 19th May the s^d Committee met in Charlotte Town (two men from each company) vested with all powers these their constituents had, or conceived they had, etc.

After a short conference about their suffering brethren besieged and suffering every hardship in Boston and the American Blood running in Lexington, etc., the Electrical fire flew into every breast, and to preserve order, choose Abraham Alexander Esquire, Chairman, and J. McK. A. Secretary. After a few hours free discussion in order to give relief to suffering America and protect our just and natural rights.

1st. We (the county) by a solemn and awful vote, dissolved abjured our allegiance to King George and the British Nation.

2^d. Declared ourselves a free and independent people, having a right and capable to govern ourselves (as a part of North Carolina.)

3^d. In order to have laws as a rule of life for our future Government we formed a Code of laws by adopting our former wholesome laws.

4th. As there were then no officers civil or military in our County

We decreed that every militia officer in s^d county should hold and occupy his former commission and grade

And that every member present of this committee should thenceforth (act) as a Justice of the Peace and in the character of a committee-man, hear and determine all controversies agreeable to s^d laws, (&c &c &c)

5th. Many other laws & ordinances were then made, (&c &c)

But in a few days (after cooling) a considerable part of s^d committee-men convened and employed Capt. James Jack (of Charlotte) to go express to Congress (then in Philadelphia) with a copy of all s^d Resolutions and laws, &c &c and a letter to our 3 members there, Richard Caswell, William Hooper & Joseph Hughes in order to get Congress to sanction or approve of them. &c &c

N. B. About 1787 Doctor Hugh Williamson (then of New York but formerly was member of Congress from this State), applied &c &c"

The above is the material part of the notes; but it may be added that after mentioning that the people of Mecklenburg agreed to send some bullocks to Boston for the relief of the suffering people there, Col. Alexander said: "And soon afterwards we smelt and felt the blood & carnage of Lexington, which raised all the passions into fury—and revenge which was the immediate cause of abjuring Great Britain on May 19 1775. April 19 1775 was the battle at Lexington."

Comparing the resolves as stated in the notes with those of May 31, 1775, we are at once struck with the fact that they have the same order; that is, the subject matter of first resolve as stated in the notes is the subject matter of first resolve of May 31: the subject matter of the second resolve as stated in the notes is the same as that of the second resolve of May 31. That of the third resolve as stated in the notes is the same as that of the third resolve of May 31.

The fourth resolve of the notes is divided into two paragraphs, the first dealing with military officers, and the second with justices of the peace. The fourth resolve of May 31 deals with military officers, and the fifth with justices of the peace.

And so it reasonably appears that Col. Alexander was trying to recall the resolves of May 31.

The resolves of May 31, 1775 were published at once in June, 1775 in the newspapers of Charleston, New Bern and Wilmington and in some newspapers at the North. They excited a great furor among the Tory officials, who sent the newspapers to London and who denounced them as the most traitorous resolves adopted in any of the Colonies. Gov. Tryon said that he was informed that the Mecklenburg Committee sent them by express to the Congress at Philadelphia. The Germans of Mecklenburg County sent to Gov. Tryon a loyal protest against them.

There is no trace or contemporaneous mention of any resolves adopted on May 20.

When Col. Polk issued his order for the election he doubtless gave ten days notice and allowed one day for the persons elected to meet at Charlotte. They met at Charlotte on May 30 and sat two days, so the resolves bear date May 31. It thus seems probable that the order for the election was issued May 19. If so the entry in the record book would start out—"On May 19th Col. Polk issued an order for an election," &c

Thus the date of May 19 perhaps was recalled by Col. Alexander, and applied by him to the meeting instead of to the order for the election. But, however that may be, all the circumstances tend to show that he had in mind the meeting of May 31, and got the date wrong.

Having made his notes after the fire of 1800, Col. Alexander appears to have obtained the assistance of some person, now unknown, to write out the narrative in full. This person was an adept in composition, if one may judge from such illustrations as the following: "Scorning to shelter themselves from the impending storm by submission to lawless powers", and such phrases as, "stimulated by that enthusiastic patriotism which elevates the mind above consideration of individual aggrandizement."—language foreign to the habits of mind of Col. Alexander.

The narrative then composed was, however, adopted by Col. Alexander, who sent a copy of it to Gen. Davie, to which he appended a certificate as follows: "It may be worthy of notice here to observe that the foregoing statement, though fundamentally correct, yet may not literally correspond with the original record of the transaction of said delegation and Court of Enquiry, as all those records and papers were burnt with the house on April 6, 1800; but previous to that time of 1800, a full copy of said records, at the request of Dr. Hugh Williamson then of New York, but formerly a representative in Congress from this State was forwarded to him, &c &c

Certified to the best of my recollection and belief, this 3^d day September 1800.

By J. McK. Alexander."

In 1817 Col. Alexander died, and his notes and the narrative "written in an unknown handwrite" were found sewed together. In 1819 this narrative was published. Its publication attracted much attention; for the fact that Mecklenburg County had declared Independence in May 1775 was remembered only by some of the people of that county, the existence of any copies of the newspapers of 1775 being unknown.

Col. William Polk obtained statements from Gen. Geo. Graham, William Hutchinson, Jonas Clark and Robert Robinson; and from John Simeson, Isaac Alexander, Samuel Wilson, and James Jack and Francis Cummins—which sustained the main fact that in May 1775, Mecklenburg declared independence; and they stated the circumstances substantially as stated in the narrative except they said that it was Col. Tom Polk who issued the order for the election. They also said that Dr. Ephraim Brevard drew up the declaration: that "it was signed by every member of the delegation under the shouts and huzzas of a very large assembly of the people of the County, who had come to know the issue of the meeting."

Mr. Simeson said: "Ours (declaration) was towards the close of May 1775. In addition to what I have already said the same committee appointed three men to secure all the military stores for the county's use—Thomas Polk, John Phifer and Joseph Kennedy. I was under arms near the head of the line, near Col. Polk, and heard him distinctly read a long string of grievances, the Declaration and military order above." This military resolution is the 20th and the last of the resolves of May 31st.

Cummins said: "At length, in the same year, 1775, I think, at least postively before July 4, 1776, the males generally of that county met on a certain day in Charlotte, and from the head of the Court-house stairs proclaimed Independence on English Government, by their herald, Col. Thomas Polk."

Nothing was said in the Alexander narrative about Dr. Brevard or Col. Polk, or about the great meeting, or about Col. Polk's proclaiming independence, or about the declaration being signed.

And it is to be noted that none of the above witnesses sustained or confirmed the language of the resolutions found in the Alexander narrative. The only reference any one of them made to any language was that of Mr. Simeson—and that identified the Declaration read by Col. Polk with the resolves of May 31.

At that time, 1819, Judge Murphey was collecting material for a State history, and he asked the aid of Col. William Polk, who corrected the Alexander narrative by making it conform to these new statements. Judge Murphey, 1820, first published Colonel Polk's narrative, and then himself dressed it up introducing new phrases and sentences here and there.

Col. Polk said in his narrative, 1820, that it was: "Resolved, That the foregoing resolutions be adopted, which was accordingly done unanimously, and that the delegates sign their names to the same. It was also resolved that a copy should be transmitted by express to the General Congress to be laid before that body, &c"

It is to be observed that the Alexander narrative makes no mention of "the signing," and it particularly negatives the statement that *the meeting* resolved to send a copy to the congress, for Col. Alexander said that "after a few days (after cooling) some considerable part of the committee-men convened and employed Capt. Jack to go express."

Judge Martin in the version of the Proceedings in Mecklenburg county, which he published in his history in 1829, annexed a new resolution as follows: "6th. Resolved, that a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by express to the President of the Continental Congress, assembled in Philadelphia, to be laid before that body."

From this it certainly appears that Judge Martin did not obtain his version from Col. Alexander, but that he fell into this particular error by copying from Col. Polk's narrative.

That he copied from the narratives of Col. Polk and Judge Murphey is also shown by his incorporating the statement that the resolutions were "signed," about which Col. Alexander is silent.

Also, a comparison of his version with the narratives of Col. Polk and Judge Murphey shows that he adopted sentence after sentence from their versions, not found at all in the Alexander narrative, such as:

Polk:—"It united them as a band of brothers whose confidence in each other and the cause which they had sworn to support was never shaken even in the worst of times"
Judge Martin:—"They became united as a band of brothers, whose confidence in each other, and the cause which they had sworn to support was never shaken in the worst of times."

There is nothing like that in the Alexander narrative.

Polk:—"It was echoed from every quarter—'Let us be independent: let us declare ourselves free and independent, and we will defend it with our lives and fortunes.' A committee was unanimously raised for the purpose."

Judge Martin:—"And all cried out, 'Let us be independent; let us declare our independence, and defend it with our lives and fortunes.' A Committee was appointed to draw up resolutions."

There is nothing like that in the Alexander narrative.

Murphey:—"These resolutions were unanimously adopted and subscribed to by the delegates. Captain James Jack, then of Charlotte, but since of Georgia, was engaged as the bearer to the President of the Continental Congress, and directed to deliver copies to Caswell, Hooper, & Hewes, the delegates to Congress from North Carolina."

Judge Martin:—"These resolutions were unanimously adopted and subscribed to by the delegates. James Jack, then of Charlotte, but now residing in the state of Georgia, was engaged to be the bearer of the resolutions to the President of Congress, and directed to deliver copies of them to the delegates in Congress from North Carolina."

It is observed that Col. Alexander says nothing about these resolutions being subscribed; nor anything about a copy being sent to the President of the Congress; nor is there anything in his narrative about "let us declare independence, &c."

Several other similiar quotations can be made proving that Judge Martin copied his version from the narratives of Col. Polk and Judge Murphey, which were written in 1820 and 1821, thus negating any suggestion that Judge Martin's version was obtained by him before the year 1800.

Nor indeed could there have been any copy of the resolves known as the Declaration of May 20 before the year 1800, as these "resolves" were written in that year; and every mention of the proceedings of Mecklenburg county made prior to 1800 was in regard to the resolves of May 31.

Some Fugitive Poems of Paul Hamilton Hayne

BY JAMES E. ROUTH, JR.,

Adjunct Professor of English in the University of Virginia.

A few years ago I found in an old collection of newspaper clippings a few poems by Timrod, and a larger number by Paul Hamilton Hayne that are not included in the standard and supposedly complete editions of these poets. The poems of Timrod were published in the *SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY*, together with a description of the source;* but, as those of Hayne were of inferior value as poetry, and in places characterized by violent sectional feeling, it seemed best to allow them to remain in my desk. After more careful consideration, however, there seems to be reason for publishing them. The growth that southern, if not national, literature owes to Hayne is not negligible. And, in tracing such a process of growth, any writing of that poet may, in the hands of the historian, develop significances that do not at first appear. Besides, poems by a man like Hayne, however bad, are not private property, and should not be dependent upon the private judgment of any one critic for their preservation.

In character these poems, of which there are seven, may be classed as of three sorts: violent war poems, amorous poems, and some miscellaneous and perfunctory poetry embodying no particular mood and plainly written as the routine performance of a professional poet in his uninspired moments. Of the violent poems the following is the truest in the ring of spontaneous and rational feeling. A comparison with the poetry of Byron, so universally imitated in the America of the sixties, will reveal the source of much of its violence and of its exclamatory style. But the sentiments are none the less genuine because the poet learned at the footstool of Byron how to put them into music. The introductory legend is reproduced as originally printed. The newspaper from which the clipping was taken could not be identified.

*January, 1903, and April, 1903.

AWAY WITH THE DASTARDS WHO WHINE OF DEFEAT

BY PAUL H. HAYNE.

["One of the most melancholy productions of an era of strife and convulsions, is the SNIVELLER, a biped that infests all classes of society, and prattles eternally from the Catechism of Despair! A babyish, nerveless fear has driven the sentiment of hope from his soul. He cringes to every phantom of apprehension, and obeys the impulses of cowardice as though they were the laws of existence. His life is the embodiment of a *whine!* He is ridden by an eternal nightmare, and emits an everlasting wail!"—Whipple.]

I

Away with the Dastards who whine of defeat,
And hint that the day of destruction draws near;
Who counsel "submission," or whisper "retreat!"
With the traitor's mistrust, and the Renegade's fear.

II

What! doff the strong armor, and yield us as slaves
To Lust and to Robbery, banded with Might;
While the standard that symbols our Liberty waves
Still flaming and fair in the front of the fight.

III

By the souls of our Fathers! I hold them accurst!
The Caitiffs who falter and flee from the strife,
Who would slake at Dishonor's foul cesspool the thirst
Of a Passion—the meanest and basest—for life!

IV

Go! crouch in the forest! Go! hide 'neath the rock:
Slink pallid and scared, into mountain and den;
We have *maidens* to fill your lost ranks in the shock
Of death and of conflict—most gallant of MEN!

V

The soul of the brave Saint of Orleans is here!
It thrills in the voices, it burns on the cheek,
Of women who heed not the wail of Despair,
And scorn the false words which the Craven would speak.

VI

"Submission!" ah, yes! we'll submit when the sod
Lies blackened and bare on the tombs of our Race,
And "retreat," when the merciful conquest of God
Shall bid us disband in His Kingdom of grace.

The next of these violent productions is also Byronic. It is more melodious than the first, but thinner in substance. Its source, as well as that of other following poems, is printed as on the original clippings, identifying not the paper but the exchange from which the poem was taken.

LINES

[From the Charleston Mercury.]

We have suffered defeat, as the bravest may suffer;
 Shall we leave unavenged our dead comrade's gore?
 O! rather, my brothers, rise up in your manhood,
 And strive as no nation ere battled before.

Come! rush from the mountains, the lowlands, the valleys—
 Rush on, like the avalanche freed from its spell,
 And lash the base cohorts who throng to enslave us,
 With stripes that will give them a foretaste of hell!

Our women, to hearthstones and altar appealing,
 Say—"Shield us from ruin, or die where you stand!"
 Our children, O God! can we fondle and bless them,
 While anarchy threatens, while despots command!

No! rise in the strength and the glow of our valor,
 And strike a great blow that shall ring through the world—
 A blow that will shatter your fetters forever,
 And leave your proud banner forever unfurled.

Paul H. Hayne.

Fort Sumter, February 26, 1862.

The next poem is more violent. The indignation may be ethically correct; but the poet, in his paroxysm of rage, loses the power of coherent composition, and can only splutter.

[From the Charleston Mercury.]

BUTLER'S PROCLAMATION.

BY PAUL H. HAYNE.

"It is ordered, that, hereafter, when any female shall, by word, gesture or movement insult or show contempt for any officer or soldier of the United States, she shall be regarded and held liable to be treated as a woman of the town plying her avocation."—Butler's order at New Orleans.*

I

Aye! drop the treacherous mask! throw by
 The cloak, which veils thine instincts fell,
 Stand forth thou base, incarnate Lie,
 Stamped with the signet brand of Hell!
 At last we view thee as thou art,
 A Trickster with a Demon's heart.

II

Off with disguise! no quarter now
 To rebel honor! thou would'st strike
 Hot blushes up the anguished brow,

*See "Goldwin Smith's Reminiscences" in McClure's Magazine for September, 1910, at page 556. In describing the incident at New Orleans, Dr. Smith says: "His [Butler's] proclamation was coarse, as anything of his was likely to be; but it did not bear, nor would any unprejudiced reader have taken it to bear, the odious sense ascribed to it."—THE EDITORS.

And murder Fame and Strength alike:
Beware! ten million hearts aflame,
Will burn with hate thou can'st not tame!

III

We know thee now! we know thy Race!
Thy dreadful Purpose stands revealed,
Naked, before the Nation's face!
Comrades let Mercy's font be sealed,
While the black Banner courts the Wind,
And cursed be he who lags behind!

IV

O! soldiers! husbands, brothers, sires!
Think that each stalwart blow ye give
Shall quench the rage of lustful fires,
And bid your glorious women live
Pure from a wrong whose tainted breath
Were fouler than the foulest death.

V

O! soldiers! lovers, Christian's [sic] men!
Think that each breeze that floats and dies
O'er the red field, from mount or glen,
Is burdened with a maiden's sighs—
And each false soul that turns to flee,
Consigns his Love to infamy!

VI

Think! and strike home!—fabled might
Of Titans were a feeble power
To that with which YOUR arms should smite
In the next awful battle-hour!
And deadlier than the bolts of Heaven
Should flash your Fury's fatal levin!

VII

No pity! let your thirsty brands
Drink their warm fill at Caitiff veins
Dip deep in blood your wrathful hands,
Nor pause to wipe those crimson stains.
Slay! Slay! with ruthless sword and will—
The God of vengeance bids you "kill".

VIII

Yes! but there's *One who shall not die*
In battle harness! One for whom
Lurks in the darkness silently
Another, and sterner Doom!
A warrior's end should crown the brave—
For *him*, swift cord! felon grave!

IX

As loathsome charnel vapors melt
 Swept by invisible winds to nought,
 So may this Fiend of lust and guilt
 Die like a nightmare's hideous thought!
 Nought left to mark the monster's name
 Save—immortality of shame!

With the two amorous poems that follow, the name of the author is not printed. But in the handwriting of the collector of these clippings is written at the end of the first the name Paul Hayne. The second is of doubtful authorship; indeed, the identification depends upon the inconclusive fact that it is printed on the same clipping with a known sonnet of the poet. It should therefore be printed with an interrogation as to authorship. In neither case is the name of the newspaper recorded.

O! Venus Aphrodite! the sole birth,
 Of perfect passion, and enduring Love,
 Vouchsafed to excommunicate from earth,
 All other creeds of beauty, and to prove
 The rapturous homage at thy happy shrine,
 The one, grand faith of men, all deem divine.

O! Venus Aphrodite! when the wave,
 Of the becalmed Ægean brought the Day,
 A vision of that glory the Gods gave,
 Humanitie's rough edge to melt away,
 The Winds grew mute, the thrilled tides owned thy might,
 Thou incarnation of the world's delight.

The sun from his blue realm of air looked down,
 Into thine eyes' supreme beatitude,
 And formed about thy golden hair a crown,
 Of many rays—the Hours their haste subdued,
 To robe thee in transparent vestments drawn,
 From the far woof of the ascending Dawn.

See where she moves! the delegated Queen,
 Of sunny shapes, sweet loves, and heavenly thought,
 Filling the air with haloes—a serene,
 Soul, from the great depths of being brought,
 To vitalise Creation—and to stir,
 The heaven, and Earth alike to worship her.

See where she moves, her white arms wreathed around,
 The daintiest of the Graces, her sweet glance,
 Most eloquent in meaning, tho, no sound,
 Of song, or speech hath broken yet the trance,

Of the lulled Ocean, and her rosy mouth,
Breathes only, the fine odors of the South.

SONNET

How have I followed every glance of thine,
How have I watch'd the changes of thy cheek,
How have I harken'd when I heard thee speak,
How I compar'd and studied line by line,
And treasur'd every sentence. How I sought
In every trifling word and casual look,
A sign and symbol of thy inmost thought,
And read thy secret soul as from a book,
I fear to tell, but never Botanist
More joyed to view his favorite flower,
Than when I saw the blossom of thy soul untwist
Its glorious folds into my eager ken,
On which, forgive me, when I learned there shone
No name inscribed—I thought to write my own.

It will be observed that, excepting the amorous sonnet, which curiously suggests Timrod, all these poems are characteristically Hayne poems. They have the typical mingling of detailed beauty with lack of composition in the poem as a whole, the flashes of a succession of small ideas without the connecting logic of any large one. They have also much of the poet's conventionality, fluent language but thin substance, facile music but no attempt at new harmonies. In the other three poems we have these same qualities. But the poems are weaker than those already given by reason of the lack of a prevailing mood. They might perhaps with justice be called machine-made. All are poems of the war. One is entitled "Scenes". Another, "The Kentucky Partisan," celebrates the prowess of Morgan. It suffices to print here that one which takes for its theme "The Merrimac".

TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 18, 1862.

[From the Charleston Courier.]

THE MERRIMAC

By PAUL H. Hayne.

We listened to the thunders
Of her mighty guns for hours,
"Till the air seemed rent asunder
By their detonating powers;
Yet, we did not dread disaster,
Whomso'ere she might attack—
For, there floated not thy Master,

Thou gallant *Merrimac*!
Thou iron-clad Invincible!
Though storm, or battle-wreck,
May gird thee with the fires of Hell,
Imperial *Merrimac*!

Across the shuddering water
Till nightfall, we could hear
The booming sounds of slaughter
Rise terrible and clear;
But a sudden roar of gladness
Rang out o'er shore and wood,
That made our joy a madness,
When the cause was understood;
For twice three hundred Hessian slaves
Before thy single track,
Had perished in the burning waves
That bore Thee! *Merrimac*!

And long, long after sunset
Thy steady thunders rolled,
And the fury of thine onset
May ne'er in words be told—
So, when with billows gory
The tide of strife went down,
We knew what awful glory
Had crowned our young Renown;
And we trusted that the Future days
Might call her prowess back,
Embalming in immortal lays
Our noble *Merrimac*!

We listened to the thunder
Of her mighty guns for hours,
Till the air seemed rent asunder
By their detonating powers;
Yet, we did not dread disaster,
Whomso'ere she might attack—
For, there floateth not thy Master
Thou gallant *Merrimac*!
Thou iron-clad Invincible!
Tho' storm, or battle wrack,
May gird thee with the fires of Hell,
Imperial *Merrimac*!

The Poetry of Jose-Maria de Heredia

By A. MARINONI,

Professor of Romance Languages in the University of Arkansas.

By way of introduction to the subject proper it appears necessary to present certain general considerations that will set in clearer light the position of M. de Heredia among the later great poets of France. We have no intention of discussing the various tendencies of art, or of hinting at its evolution along well nigh predetermined lines. Poetry is no longer a popular necessity and an esthetic manifestation of society; in all branches, save in the drama, poetry is now entirely individual, and hence in any discussion the personal element is preponderant.

It might be maintained that the phenomenon of co-existent literary schools, each claiming supremacy, is significant of a complete dismemberment of the theory of art; certainly it is true that great synthetic poetry is no longer possible, and not because of the lack of productive genius sufficiently great. As a result of the highly critical character of our times, there is a certain inevitable tendency to subdivision; each individual artistic attitude assumes a personal or party tinge. Schools arise—the Romantic, the Parnassian, the *Decadants*, the *Verslibristes*, and what not—more numerous in France than elsewhere, each active in its purpose to prove that it alone possesses the true theory of art. Dogmatism invades literature, and with it polemic and apology. Force of tradition, a special aptitude of the race, a peculiar Parisian zeal in discussing literary questions,—these and other factors have produced a multiplicity of schools characteristic of France, and of no other country.

In each literary school of France there is a head about whom are grouped those who hold to a common theory of art. Though apparently a species of hierarchy, yet the school does not serve to restrict the personal liberty of the artist; it merely gives direction to his individuality. And the influence of the school is good in that by continuous debate the love and study of art are kept alive. Now, since no general criterium of poetry is to-day possible each school is bound to express nothing more than the agreement of several writers on a common canon of art.

In dealing with the poetical productions of Heredia we find that their preeminent characteristics, both with regard to form and content, are largely associated with the artistic theories of the Parnassian School, and at the same time are representative of the authoritative influence of its leader, Leconte de Lisle. The latter poet is undoubtedly the one who has, in recent times, shown in all his works the highest conception of the aim of poetry and the greatest concern for purity of form. Leconte de Lisle, a meditative and austere genius, disgusted with the extravagances of the Romantic School, desired to lead poetry to a more intellectual end and to free poetic expression from a carelessness supposedly condoned by inspiration. He proposed to set forth in his poetry the historic development of the religious spirit, and of the scientific spirit. Around him, about the year 1865, a group of promising young poets collected, among them José Maria de Heredia.

Aside from a perfect community of ideas concerning art, Leconte de Lisle and Heredia were soon united by a strong open friendship. This may partly account for the great interest that Leconte de Lisle took in the poetical labor of his disciple, and may explain how he saw produced, one by one, the hundred and eighteen sonnets of Heredia which, with the *Romancero* and a short epic, *Les Conquerants de l'Or*, constitute his entire contribution to poetry and all his claim to immortality.

The prefatory letter to Heredia's only volume of verse, *Les Trophees*, contains a statement that may help the reader to a fuller appreciation of the final intentions of the poet: "Vous (Leconte de Lisle) m'avez assure que ce livre bien qu'en partie inacheve, garderait neanmoins aux yeux du lecteur indulgent quelque chose de la noble ordonnance que j'avais reuee." It seems, then, that the horizon of the poet was to be of larger circumference; and, in fact, the numerous subdivisions to which the subject matter of Heredia's sonnets is assigned give the impression that some links are missing in a consistent and unified plan. As it is, we can only regret that Heredia has not revealed more completely to us each of the epochs of which he has, with keen intuition, reproduced the most characteristic expressions and the leading figures. It remains now to be seen in what surroundings and under what influences the poetic genius of Heredia was matured and developed.

To the almost exclusively personal element of the Romantic poetry the greater poets after 1850 add the historical and scientific element. In France the poetic work of Leconte de Lisle and Prudhomme are highly representative of this tendency; and in Italy the greatest lyric of the century, Carducci, is called the poet of history. This means that in place of poetry based on pure inspiration we have poetry of both inspiration and reflection; from which we infer that the special and natural aptitude of the poet will be supplemented with a systematic and precise study and will find expression after a serious process of careful preparation. This is why the poetry of Prudhomme, besides the depth of its psychological analysis, contains also a kind of scientific preoccupation. The poetry of Leconte de Lisle is largely historical and scientific; and that of Heredia, a student at the Ecole des Chartes and translator of Bernal de Castillo's work, *La veridique histoire de la Nouvelle Espagne*, is almost entirely concerned with historical representation. These characteristics of content are an indication that the mysterious afflatus of Romantic passion has given way for a less subjective poetry. We know that a leading characteristic of the Parnasse was an extreme reticence, if not lack in the emotional, and in consequence a tendency toward concealment of the creating personality. We often hear of the *statue Parnassienne*, which may be indirectly alluded to in that line of Verlaine:

Est-elle en marbre, ou non, la Venus de Milo ?

as figurative of that presumed impassibility that caused the Parnassians to seek a more artistic precision in form and a thought content more nearly related to the intellectual activity of the time in the various fields of scientific investigation. In this regard there can be no doubt that Heredia is the most thoroughly coherent exponent of the theories of the Parnasse, indeed, to a much higher degree than Leconte de Lisle himself. In fact, the latter is often unable to conceal in his poetry a certain sympathy or disdain that are the more impressive as they are seemingly unintentional. With Heredia it is different. His poetry is altogether intellectual in appeal; sentiment is exceedingly rare, and the personal element is almost entirely lacking. From mythology, history, nature Heredia borrows his subjects and represents them in sonnets that are a plastic expression of pure beauty devoid of all

spiritual emotion. In fact, after even a superficial study of Heredia's poetry, we see that it inclines to an intellectual type—intellectual because it detaches itself entirely from the emotional quality which was the *faculte maitresse* of poetry during the times of flourishing Romanticism. This accounts for the effect of deep and cold meditation that Heredia's sonnets almost exclusively produce.

But which of the senses that convey the outside world to us is preeminent in esthetic importance? In this connection we know that the sense of sight in the poetry of Baudelaire, for instance, is no better than the average when it comes to artistic representation, and hence Lanson's remark that his *Tableaux Parisiens* are useless paintings. Baudelaire's opinion seems to have been that the senses which lend themselves naturally to poetry, smell and touch, are above all others in importance; in fact, much of his originality as a poet consists in having exploited such a view. On the other hand, it is well known that the modern school of symbolism gives an undue preponderance to the quality of sound. In the poetry of Heredia the elements appealing to the sense of sight are preferred as those that are esthetically the best in that they call into play purely intellectual faculties; then comes the sense of hearing and in almost insignificant proportions the senses of touch, smell and taste. Though such classification may not coincide in order with the relative biological value of each sense, yet for us this is the order as determined by importance from the standpoint of intellectual appreciation, and we realize that such is the unconsciously adopted order on which classic art is based.

Let us now analyze at length the general content and form of Heredia's poetry so as to gain a more adequate idea of the patient development of his artistic intentions.

Some forty sonnets on Greece and Sicily constitute the first division of his *Trophees*, and, though the range of subjects treated is very wide, they all present a characteristic in that the poet attempts to revive in their most important aspects those divinities of ancient times that appear to us as symbolical personifications of natural forces. Such an historical interpretation of classical mythology precludes any expression of the personal element, and each sonnet portrays to us the plastically and objec-

tively various mythological figures in their harmonious communion with nature of which it may be said that they are the ideal expression.

In the first series of sonnets, *Hercule et les Centaures*, for instance, one of the most impressive elements that inspires the poet is the gigantic aspect both of the mythological figures he evokes and of nature as well. Typical are the closing lines of the sonnet *Nemce*:

Car l'ombre grandissante avec le crepuscule
Fait, sous l'horrible peau qui flotte autour d'Hercule
Melant l'homme a la bete un monstrueux heros.

Or, the close of the sonnet, *Fuite de Centaures*, in which the fleeing centaur is overcome with fear,

Car il a vu la lune eblouissante et pleine
Allonger derriere eux, supreme epouvantail
La gigantesque horreur de l'Ombre Herculeenne.

The last cycle of sonnets of this first division, *La Grece et la Sicile*, under the caption, *Epigrammes et Bucoliques*, is the one in which the originality of historical representation is perhaps shown to greatest advantage. In these the poet demonstrates forcefully how keenly he has fathomed the spirit as well as the language of funeral inscriptions. All the little word pictures of ancient epigraphy are given not only by suggestion but in true paraphrases and often in almost literal translations. When the poet says: "Arrete. Ecoute-moi, voyageur", we are reminded of the humble Latin prayer: "Hospes . . . adsta ac pellige," and the usual wish, "O Terre, soyez-lui legere", recalls the original expression, "Sit tibi terra levis". Throughout it is the pagan grief of the tomb which evokes life in all its beauty, "La vie est si douce". There are also allusions to the games of antiquity of which the foot and chariot races were the preferred; both *Le Coureur* and *Le Cocher* are master-pieces of plastic art, the latter possibly inspired by the epitaph of an *auriga*, *Crescens*, the former by the famous statue of Myron, *The Runner*.

In the next great cycle of sonnets, *Rome et les Barbares*, the poet has not followed any definite plan in regard to historic chronology. His subjects, humble or great, are effectively chosen from the greatest epochs in Roman history. In the very first sonnet of

this collection, *Pour le vaisseau de Virgile*, we have the aspiration of a poet for a poet which for the first time causes Heredia to show himself in the closing lines:

La moitié de mon ame est dans la nef fragile
Qui, sur la mer sacrée ou chantait Orion
Vers la terre des Dieux porte le grand Virgile.

The "moitié de mon ame" reminds one of "animae dimidium meae" in Horace's farewell to Virgil.

The five sonnets under the general title, *Hortorum deus*, are perhaps the most striking of the collection because of the unexpected subjects developed in them. We are still in the realm of mythology, but the latter is presented to us in its comic aspect. The poet was, without doubt, struck by the singularity of Priapus whom the Romans honored as the god of shepherds, and each of the sonnets in which the comicity of the god is portrayed seems to have been inspired by the two greatest lyrists of Rome, Catullus and Horace. We know that the Greek poets also laughed at Priapus, and Theocritus had already written a biting epigram on the rude images of the god. In the sonnets of Heredia all the comic elements of the ancient poets are enlarged and completed. And he paraphrases the "Olim truncus eram ficulnus" of Horace in speaking thus of the god:

Ris du sculpteur, Passant, mais songe à l'origine
De Priape, et qu'il peut rudement se venger;

and further the comedy becomes farce when the poet reproduces the effect of the Catullian "Ecce, villicus venit," as the god whispers a word of hope to the daring gamins:

Un negligent Priape habite un elos voisin.

From such simple themes we pass to the epic representation of great historical figures and episodes of ancient Rome in sonnets that many consider the best in the *Trophees*. Of these the three on *Antoine et Cleopatre* are especially striking. No synthetic poetry has ever brought out more forcibly a greater intensity of action, a keener study of characters and of the tragic end of deceitful and treacherous love. Both Antony and Cleopatra are presented to us by a most vigorous historical imagination, as when the poet succeeds in vivifying the shameful flight of Cleopatra at the battle of Actium by a truly prophetic inspiration that enhances the lyric effect of the closing lines of the last sonnet:

Et sur elle coube, l'ardent Imperator
 Vit dans ses larges yeux etoiles de points d'or
 Toute une mer immense ou fuyaient des galeres.

The last line is Virgilian in cast and recalls the imposing ocean scene of the Aeneid:

Disiectam Aeneae toto videt aequore classem,

We pass anew to very humble subjects in the group, *Sonnets Epigraphiques*, which the poet wrote during his stay at Bagneres de Luchon, a bathing resort of the Central Pyrenees. In this poetry *des humbles* we find a touching sympathy for the humble of the past. Despite the great distance of time, they have found something more than a simple artistic inspiration in the heart of the poet. We find in these sonnets that same palpitation of unknown life that such poets as Sainte-Beuve and Coppee have expressed in our own time. Heredia has understood and rendered with appreciative intuition all the simplicity contained in the few Latin inscriptions, indeed poor and brief, that he found scattered upon solitary peaks near Bagneres de Luchon. How delicate and primitive in grace is the sonnet, *Fago deo*, and how profound and touching the illusion of the slave, Geminus, who dedicated a small stone as a memorial,

Aux monts, gardiens sacres de l'apre liberte.

And the sad exile of the poor Sabinula who evokes a deeper sympathy and, in telling you of her present exile, seems to call to mind the past which lives in memories and never returns.

The next cycle of sonnets, *Le Moyen Age et la Renaissance*, contains the spirit that informs the two epochs—the militant faith that produced the crusades, the renewal of the artistic and humanistic impulses that found expression in Petrarch, Ronsard, Joachim du Bellay, and in sculpture, painting, and all the lesser arts. Yet amidst the stirrings of this new life the greatest event of the age, the discovery of the New World, is evoked in some of the best sonnets of the *Trophees*, *Les Conquerants*. The almost legendary *Conquistadores* of the early expeditions are portrayed in poems that, though not purely epic, yet have the force and movement of epic representation. And it seems as if the heroic figures of the leaders loom up more imposing, enveloped as they are in a certain veil of mystery that made their daring adventures in unknown lands more appealing to poetic imagination.

Heredia was a Cuban by birth, and his family boasted among its ancestors the founder of Cartagena de Indias whom the poet evokes in the sonnet, *A un Fondateur de Ville*, and this may partly explain why he felt so deeply the charm and grandeur of such enterprises.

In the last cycle of sonnets of the *Trophées*, under the title, *La Nature et la Reve*, we have material for an appreciation of Heredia as a landscapist. In some respects these last sonnets are the most important of the entire collection, principally because in them the individual manner of the poet in representing the aspects of nature is expressed. It may at first seem strange that the personal element should be here more in evidence than anywhere else in his work. Certainly nature must have made a deeper impression upon the poet than the purely historical subject matter previously treated by him; and yet, even though the poet reveals himself, his impressions appear to us more like a reflection of collective humanity than of his own individuality.

The most remarkable among the sonnets of this collection are perhaps those which call to mind in all their richness of color and sound *La Mer de Bretagne*. No one but a fervent admirer of seascapes could have painted such pictures as these. The fact that the poet was born in an island of the Atlantic may account for the charm more powerfully felt and for a more spontaneous admiration of youthful remembrance for the sea. And so in *Brise Marine* the poet asks himself:

Ce souffle étrangement parfume, d'où vient-il ?

And his thoughts go back to his far away home:

Oh! Je le reconnais. C'est de trois mille lieues
Qu'il vient, de l'Ouest, là-bas ou les Antilles bleues
Se pament sous l'ardeur de l'astre occidental.

He perceives the sea after the classical manner, in its immensity, in its sonority, in its chiaro-oscuro effects:

La mer jusqu'au couchant pourpre
Ceruleenne ou rose ou violette ou perse
Ou blanche de moutons que le reflux disperse
Verdoie à l'infini comme un immense pré.

And elsewhere:

L'une apres l'autre, avec de furieux elans,
 Les lames glauques sous leur criniere d'ecume,
 Dans un tonnerre sourd s'eparpillant en brume,
 Empanachent au loin les recifs ruisselants.

It is when in the presence of the sea that the poet cannot but place something of himself in his work, something, however, that is not really intimate and exclusively personal but is rather identified with sensations that may be common to every one of us. No better illustration of such personal note can be offered than in the two sonnets, *Armor* and *La Conque*. The closing tercet of the first one is typical:

Et mon coeur savoura, devant l'horizon vide
 Que reculait vers l'Ouest l'ombre immense du soir
 L'ivresse de l'espace et du vent intrepide.

The other is so perfect in form that it could hardly be dismembered without injury:

Par quels troids Oceans, depuis combien d'hivers,
 —Qui le saura jamais, Conque frele et nacree!—
 La houle, les courants et les raz de marée
 T'ont-ils roulee au creux de leurs abîmes verts?

Aujourd'hui, sous le ciel, loin des reflux amers,
 Tu t'es fait un doux lit de l'arene doree.
 Mais ton espoir est vain. Longue et desesperée,
 En toi gemit toujours la grande voix des mers.

Mon ame est devenue une prison sonore;
 Et comme en tes replis pleure et soupire encore
 La plainte du refrain de l'ancienne clameur:

Ainsi du plus profond de ce coeur trop plein d'Elle,
 Lourde, lente, insensible et pourtant eternelle,
 Gronde en moi l'orageuse et lointaine rumeur.

The peculiar power of epic representation that we have observed in the sonnets of Heredia is further shown in the two last poems of his only volume of verse, namely, the *Romancero* and *Les Conquerants de l'Or*. The original *Romancero*, which Villemain calls the *Iliade populaire* of the Spaniards, is a famous collection of romances, songs, and epic fragments that furnished the plan of the Spanish drama by Guillen de Castro, and later of the French tragedy, *Le Cid*, by Corneille. It is likewise a source of inspiration to Heredia, who, under the same title, *Romancero*,

represents the most important episodes of the legendary history of the Cid. Accordingly, the little epic of Heredia is divided into three parts, each fixing the salient points of the legend, that is, the choosing of the younger son to avenge the insult to his aged father; the victory of the son over the count, who is killed in a duel; and finally the triumph of the son, Rodrigue, who delivers his country from the invaders, and his subsequent rehabilitation in the eyes of Chimene, whom he marries. The Spanish original is very closely followed in the poem of Heredia, and the chivalrous sentiment of the legend is reproduced in an effective and concise form. And this is the more natural since no scenic difficulties and limitations confront him. The metric form used in the poem is the *terzina* that Heredia handles in a fashion no less masterly than does Leconte de Lisle himself.

The other epic poem, *Les Conquerants de l'Or*, might have been inspired by the sonnet, *Les Conquerants*. In this the poet has tried to reconstruct the hardy adventures of Pizzaro, who journeyed with his party of braves from the Atlantic coast of Central America to the fabulous conquest of the empire of the Incas. Each of the six parts of the poem treats of an episode of this memorable expedition. The historical account is enveloped with a kind of legendary veil through which we love to reconstruct the great deeds of a remote past, and which makes it the more interesting and imposing. In the last part of the poem is centered the epic interest of the narrative. It ends with a marvellous picture representing the heroes under Pizzaro's leadership face to face with the armies of the Incas on the western slopes of the Andes. Like the survivors of the ten thousand of Xenophon who saluted the sea of Hellas, so from the sharp crags of the Andes,

formidable, enflammee,
D'un haut pressentiment tout entiere l'armee,
Brandissant ses drapeaux sur l'Occident vermeil,
Salua d'un grand cri la chute du soleil.

The genius of Heredia is wholly and truly Latin, by birth, education, and taste. He had in his veins the blood of the Conquistadores of whom he sang, and one of his ancestors, Pedro de Heredia, followed Cortez in his conquests and founded in 1533 Cartagena de Indias. The poet was reared in Cuba and educated in France; so his muse was ever inspired by events in

the history of the Latin races, and his landscapes are for the most part those of his native country or of the land of his adoption. He is Latin in taste, acknowledging the powerful impulse that the literature and art of the Latin races has always felt toward a harmonious perfection of form. Patient search for perfect form was the constant preoccupation of Heredia, and this might have determined his choice of the sonnet as a means of expression.

With Heredia more than with any other of the contemporary poets, the sonnet has attained that just measure of lines, that preciseness in particulars, that varied richness which never betrays the slow process of preparation, all, finally, of those superior qualities which make of the sonnet one of the most difficult if not the most difficult and trying of poetic forms. In his patient attempt to become a consummate master of poetic form he is really a Parnassian, but as he held himself rigorously in the realm of pure objectivity it follows that his poetry lacks that resonance, that delicate and indefinable music which goes to the heart. His appeal is esthetic and intellectual only.

Perhaps this procedure in art is not altogether the best. But even though it may seem dull and somewhat cold in attraction, we are nevertheless greatly impressed with the fact that Heredia has held strictly and consistently to his theories of art. And it is doubtless remarkable that the effort of nearly thirty years of work is not at all visible in his poems. That he should have preferred the sonnet to all other poetic forms is not surprising. An artist who possessed a taste so much inclined toward everything that is formally exact, of necessity, should have a natural *penchant* for a poem based on rigorous rules, as the sonnet. Baudelaire had said: "Parce que la forme est contraignante, l'idée jaillit plus intense. Il y a la la beauté du métal ou du minéral travaillés." That is why the poet of the *Fleurs du Mal* preferred the sonnet. And yet, Baudelaire did not observe strictly in his sonnets what he calls a *forme contraignante*, and metrical necessities very likely led him to disregard all fixed rules so that he even wrote heterometric sonnets. Heredia, on the contrary, never swerves and always wields in a successful manner this "binding form". The only liberty that he has taken, provided that it may be so called, consists in the variety of his combina-

tions of rhymes. This preference of Heredia for the sonnet is a proof of his tendency toward plastic art, an art which manifests itself with a form precise and clear in dimensions. In fact, one may well consider the sonnet as analogous to the statue. It is because of its exact outline that the precision of details, both in form and content, appear forcefully in evidence, and its defects are more easily detected. It should not be difficult to explain how the poet has attained such an excellency of technique when we know that Heredia had been thinking about his cycle of sonnets almost thirty years before they were published. So each sonnet was written with the jealous care, with the indifference to time that was characteristic of the workers in metal in the Middle Ages. We may well apply to Heredia the well-known lines of Gautier:

Sculpteur, lime, cisele,
Que ton reve flottant
Se scelle
Dans le bloc resistant.

There yet remains to be discussed the verse-structure in the poems of Heredia, but in order to treat this subject exhaustively it would be necessary to give a minute technical study. Accordingly our attention will linger briefly upon those principal qualities which seem to be characteristic of the poetry of Heredia.

With reference to rhyme, we know that in order to produce an effect of surprise, however slight it be, it is necessary that rhyming words be as diverse in meaning as they are similar in sound. This carries in consequence the aversion for the rhymes called *banales*, which consist, for example, in rhyming a word with itself or its antonym, and more often yet in making words rhyme whose continual association has greatly diminished their poetic value, as *fureur*, *horreur*, *gloire*, *victoire*, etc. Heredia is not merely an excellent rhymers. Indeed his deliberate richness of rhymes is extraordinary. His esthetically eclectic taste has been guided in the search for full effects of rhyme by the beauty and the intimate force of words. If he has been successful in doing this we must recognize in him a great power of verbal invention. What a difference in this regard between Heredia and Baudelaire who seems to have been haunted always by the difficulty of rhyme, as he himself said:

Je vais m'exercer seul a ma fantasque escrime
Flairant dans tous les coins les hasards de la rime.

Certainly it is not because of his originality in the choice of rhymes that Heredia is a great poet, but were we to take literally this paradox of Theodore de Banville, "l'imagination de la rime est entre toutes la qualite qui constitue le poete", Heredia could justly be classed a great poet.

As to the rythm in the poetry of Heredia, leaving aside both what pertains to the varied distribution of rythmic accents in his verse and the effective use of *enjambement*, there are three qualities that are above all others in importance, namely, his predilection for long words, alliteration, and assonance.

Theorists on metrics sometimes differ as to the effect of polysyllabic words on the rythm of verse, but it is generally admitted that long words well chosen and judiciously employed usually give to the verse an impression of fullness, of continuity, of ease, such as short words cannot give. In this regard we may remark that while in the poetry of Leconte de Lisle, and to a greater extent in the poetry of Baudelaire, long words are almost always intimately associated with such ideas as languor, melancholy, indifference, insensibility, with Heredia they are usually employed to express sensorial states. Here are a few examples:

"La gigantesque horreur de l'ombre Herculeenne."

"Silencieusement vers le soleil aboie."

"Dans l'ombre transparente indolemment il rode."

"Tout est mort. Sur la roche uniformement grise . . ."

If one proposed to present a systematic analysis of the use which Heredia makes of alliteration and assonance the task would be far more difficult, for these are undoubtedly the preponderant qualities of his poetry. In fact, of the modern French poets no one has sought to a greater extent pure esthetic beauty in a greater variety and richness of alliteration and assonance. What part the poet's imagination or his tendency in art played in finding expression for so many happy combinations and correspondences of sound we cannot say. We feel, however, that in spite of plausible contentions to the contrary, the fact of attaining a certain poetic excellence, even exclusively formal, cannot be reduced to mere technical skill. But, one may ask, are all the alliterations in Heredia's poetry convincing? We realize that

with regard to this question, which calls into play a purely musical quality, the results of a personal appreciation are bound to be somewhat indefinite. There is but one single instance in all the sonnets of Heredia in which alliteration seems to betray a rather exaggerated effect of virtuosity. The passage in question is as follows :

Laisse, ami, l'errante chevre,
Sourde aux chevrotements du chevreau qu'elle sevre
Escalader la roche et brouter les bourgeons.

What is evident, however, is that the esthetic excellence in the poetry of Heredia resulting from alliteration and assonance is due in large measure to his classic taste, to his extremely musical ear, and to the sureness with which he judges the expressive value of sounds. Here, too, as in the case of rhymes, we must be careful not to give too precise a meaning to his alliterations and assonances. In general, they do not express a spiritual state, and rarely does the poet wish to convey any definite idea by means of sounds. It seems rather as if the purpose of the poet is simply to give a more evident and an almost sensible formal beauty to the verse, and this because Heredia believed, and with reason, that the caressing impression of certain sonorous accords is already in itself esthetically sufficient. Here are a few examples :

- 1 Dont l'herbe solitaire ensevelit la gloire.
- 2 Ecoute sans fremir, du fond des nuits sereines
La mer qui se lamente en pleurant les Sirenes.
- 3 Car elle a vu, d'un vol vertigineux et sur,
Allonger sur la mer sa grande ombre d'azur.
- 4 A l'appel du Heros s'enlevant d'un seul bond,
Bat le ciel ebloui de ses ailes de flamme.
- 5 Et tes soupirs d'amour, de ce tuyau sacre,
S'envoleront parmi l'harmonieuse halcine.
- 6 S'envole, tinte et meurt dans le ciel rose et pale.

The harmony of these verses is, as one can see, clearly delineated and produced by the recurrence of sounds which have purely musical effect, no other being desired.

Thus Heredia, consistently preoccupied with purely esthetic form and with an implacable objectivity that goes far beyond the tendencies of his own time, seems to be in the modern literature of France a miracle of poetic precision and virtuosity. Aloof from

all tenderness, from all sympathy, from all intellectual or spiritual trouble, his only emotion is that stirred by the beautiful resulting from the harmony of sparkling colors, of graceful outline of contours, of a highly musical rhythm. There is no shade of introspection in his poetry, not the least evidence of speculation or dream. As Pellissier says: "On aimerait de surprendre quelque faiblesse, ne fut-ce que pour s'y montrer indulgent. Mais sa magnificence continue, son indefectible exactitude, nous refusent cette satisfaction." The question as to whether poetry ought to be conceived in a different way is here irrelevant, but what is really important for us to observe is that no French poet has ever before handled more successfully the sonnet form. And as to the influence that Heredia has exercised on contemporary poetry in France, recent productions show that it has been considerable. He has indeed contributed to revive classical taste, an exacting preoccupation for perfection in form, and, more important than all, he has with patience and tenacity urged the younger poets of France to realize that "l'art est long et le temps est court."

The South Carolina Cotton Mill Village—A Manufacturer's View.*

By THOMAS F. PARKER,
President of the Monaghan Cotton Mills.

In South Carolina 150,000 persons, or one fifth of its white population, live in cotton mill villages, while in the counties of Greenville, Spartanburg, and Anderson one third of the population is in these villages; and the villages continue to grow. The South Carolina mill village is usually a separate community, sometimes having a population of over 5,000 inhabitants. It is entirely owned and controlled by the mill, and its residents have no village corporation of any kind. These villages are built by the mill managements for the simple reason that their people could not otherwise be housed near a mill. Being indigenous to their locality, they attract much more attention from strangers than from Southerners; for strangers seeing in them for the first time the general poverty and other distressful conditions of our people, handicapped as they have been with legacies from slavery and war, associate these only with the village. But all Carolinians know that these villagers are of the same stock as they themselves, being composed as a class of the less successful, to whom the mills have offered much better wages, with better labor and living conditions, than they had before.†

It is undeniable that South Carolina mill managements, owing to various causes, come into closer personal touch with their individual operatives, and feel more interest in them as a body, than do Eastern cotton manufacturers, and that South Carolina operatives have been benefited by coming to the mills; that the separate cottages of Southern mill villages, with plenty of air and larger grounds, are better than the city tenements generally used by such operatives in the East, and that the village living condi-

*In substance, an address delivered on this subject by request on Benefactor's Day at Trinity College, October 3, 1910.

†A former article, published in *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, October, 1909, dealt with the South Carolina mill, and this deals with its adjunct, the village. The article is limited to South Carolina villages, because the writer is more familiar with their conditions than those of other localities.

tions, as a rule, are steadily improving. Nor are these actual conditions affected by the fact that the immense influence of the mills for good in the state has been only incidental to making money for their stockholders, and that the building of churches and schools in the villages and contributing to their support by the corporations was largely a business necessity. It must also be recognized that, because the villages are owned by the corporations and are entirely separated from other communities, the villagers are dependent on the corporations for their environment to a much greater extent than are operatives in New England, who live in a city with its numerous helpful agencies.

This population has only recently been collected under conditions radically new to it, and for obvious reasons, therefore, is going to change for better or for worse. It has as yet no labor unions, nor has it been much used by demagogues. The best development of its peculiar potentialities for good and the control of those for evil constitute a problem vitally affecting the state at every point, political, religious, commercial, and social, and for the solution of which the most modern methods of scientific investigation and of high organization can well be employed.

Steady work under sanitary and moral conditions, an equitable wage, reasonable hours of labor, and a proper age limit are among the essentials for the well-being of employees; but living conditions outside of the factory which we are discussing are but little less important, and over these in the southern cotton mill village the manufacturer has irresistible power in some directions and a strong influence in others. Individuals, communities, and state authorities have also their influence and power. Indeed, recognition is now becoming more general that the living and working conditions of any of the citizens of a state are public matters of vital importance to all citizens of that state and indeed of the whole nation. The children and youth of a people are unquestionably its most valuable assets, to be used wisely and not wastefully, and to be saved and developed for the future as well as to be profitably employed for the present.

The poorest one fifth of the white population of a state, collected together for the first time from isolated homes into villages surrounded by conditions entirely new to it, makes a strong appeal to one's sympathies, especially the young boys and the

"little mothers" (girls of ten to fourteen years of age), who in the village so often care for the younger children and do the house-keeping. These people are illiterate and otherwise untaught; but they have good physical and mental ability, and when stimulated to a desire for better things quickly develop in character, intelligence, and efficiency. Most mill superintendents know from experience that any illiterate child who goes to the average village school for a year is thereby increased in mill efficiency, besides being made a better citizen in general; and what the school does for the child, other agencies can do for young men and women in the village.

Remembering the importance of the issues involved and the responsiveness of the people, let us consider the agencies for good at work in these villages. Their preachers, as a class, are at present the least educated and efficient of their helpers. Of course there are some marked exceptions. They are furnished a house and are paid from \$600.00 to \$800.00 per annum salary, which often with their lack of education and perhaps limited capacity for work is as much as they could earn in any other occupation. The village school teacher does not receive an average salary of over \$40.00 per month for nine months, or \$360.00 per annum, and often overworked and underpaid has to teach as many as 50 or considerably more not well graded scholars. These teachers are mostly left to their own resources without helpful county or state supervision. All kinds of physicians practise in mill villages, including a few of the best and many of the worst, which latter class makes a specialty of them because they cannot get practice elsewhere. Such are the paid workers of most South Carolina villages.

The cost of the buildings of the 140 South Carolina mills which had been built by 1907 was given by Mr. August Kohn in a series of able articles as over \$100,000,000, and their total village population as 125,000; and he estimates that they had invested in school buildings from \$300,000 to \$350,000, and had contributed to the building of 200 churches.*

As probably every mill in South Carolina has made some investments of this character, if we accept Mr. Kohn's figures as

*The Cotton Mills of South Carolina by August Kohn, published in book form in 1907, by the News & Courier, Charleston, S. C.

correct we shall be justified in saying that the average mill, costing \$714,285.00 and having a village population of 892 persons, has spent \$2,500 in school buildings, has contributed to two church buildings, and has made some other small building investments. In addition, such a mill contributes perhaps as much as \$500.00 per annum to the support of preachers, teachers, and other welfare agencies.

Now, most mill managements have considered that expenses on the part of the corporation for better agencies than those above mentioned are unwarranted; but there can be few who, after careful consideration, will pronounce them adequate or at all on a par in efficiency with the agencies employed by the mills in the manufacturing of their products. For leaving out of account the salary of the general superintendent of the mill, we find that the foreman of each room is paid from \$900 to \$1500 per annum, according to the size of the mill, and that the average pay of operatives, including children, is \$1.10 per day, or \$28.00 per month, or \$336 per annum, and that the pay of the efficient operative is \$1.75 per day.

The value of village church and school buildings depends more than is generally realized on the instruction given in them. Without competent workers and the active earnest support of the mill authorities they perform their functions no better than a mill would with antiquated useless machinery, for they only make a show and a noise, and appear to do what they do not do.

These villagers as a result of their former isolation have everything to learn. Their children and youth have literally to be taught any organized game, and the housekeeper, in fact the entire village, is equally in need of similar "help for beginners;" which need is none the less real because mostly overlooked or taken for granted as incurable. And through no one's fault, but as the result of past and present local circumstances, few, if any, manufacturing villages of the world are more destitute of interest and amusements for the people than are those of the average South Carolina mills, where the new arrivals to civilization have nothing to do outside the mill but "hang round the house or store," and occasionally attend church or a secret order meeting.

If mills could afford a yearly average expenditure of 1 per cent. of their capital for adequate buildings and competent welfare

workers with active support by the presidents, the villagers would quickly be revolutionized, and not only would they retain a true friendliness towards the management, which is decreasing, but would escape the future control of demagogues and labor agitators.

In South Carolina the mill companies are the only source of village financial aid, for all stockholders take for granted that the company is doing what is right and best about the village, and never make any personal contributions; nor do outside organizations or communities do so, with the exception of moderate contributions from the Baptist and Methodist Home Mission Boards, and a very few other scattered contributions.* Though no mill has made an average annual outlay of 1 per cent. of its capital on welfare work, yet some ten have undertaken such work more extensively than the average mill with only its church, school, and secret order hall, and these efforts have for some time attracted considerable attention in this state and elsewhere.

Welfare work in South Carolina villages has been a gradual outgrowth of the effort of the corporation to meet local needs by the employment of trained workers assisted by the mill presidents. Its motive has been a genuine desire to help the operative, and methods have been found profitable alike to the employees and employers. It has endeavored to inspire each employee with a desire to do his best and to furnish him with the means of doing it in a helpful environment. The principal agencies employed to the present among these mills doing this work, though no one mill has all of them, are medical dispensaries, with loan closets and rooms for surgical operations, and baths, all under the supervision of a trained nurse who also teaches a health club and does district nursing; club houses for men and women, well equipped as social and educational centers, with gymnasium, baths, classrooms, and so forth, all under the management of an educated and competent secretary; savings banks; well regulated libraries with competent librarians; nursery kindergartens and day nurseries; parks with swimming pools and shower baths for men and women and splash pools for the children; cooking and sewing classes, taught by teachers with diplomas for such work; night

*Other denominations contribute a little in a very few villages. The portion of a mill's tax applied to the public school fund fully equals the amount paid by the state and county to that mill's public school.

classes in reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, and music for both sexes, and in mill calculations, textile designing and mechanical drawing for men, all classes being taught by paid teachers; debating clubs and literary societies under competent leadership; well organized village fairs for educational purposes; instruction in keeping yards, gardens, and so forth; with prizes for the best. A number of our mills have adopted a very liberal policy in case of accidents, practically making them a charge against the company whether they are the operative's fault or not. They also freely advance money on time due in the office to their operatives where it seems needed, or lend money in small amounts at a moderate rate of interest.

Repainting a village and repairing buildings cannot be included in welfare work, but much improvement now being done can be so classed, such as planting shade trees, lighting the streets and houses with electricity, plastering with wood fibre for freedom from bugs, placing water and toilets in the cottages in connection with village septic tanks and other such work. Such improvements make the lives of operatives better worth living, and naturally attract and develop a high class of operatives. And after all, what we need in our villages is not so much numbers as efficiency, general intelligence, and character; for unintelligent, unskilled labor is in the long run not only unprofitable but dangerous to capital.

In one of the villages last referred to the attempt is being made to conduct welfare work as thoroughly and systematically as is manufacturing. Stress is laid on the efficiency of the workers rather than on the buildings, which to the present are few. A yearly census is taken in which the age, name, and occupation of each person is given, and the needs of each are discussed by the welfare workers. The whole village is organized, as it were, into departments which co-operate for the general good. A strong village spirit has been developed, which prides itself on the increasing Christian character, thrift, education, efficiency, and general good citizenship of the people.

This mill was organized ten years ago and has been in operation nine years, and its welfare work has been of very gradual growth. The population of the village is over 1600 inhabitants and the mill employs over 500 operatives. The 216 families liv-

ing in the village have resided there without a break in residence as follows: 46 less than one year; 36 one year; 40 two years; 26 three years; 29 four years; 15 five years; 11 six years; 6 seven years; 5 eight years; 5 nine years. Of these families 78 returned after having left. The above list does not include more than 30 families who have bought their own homes.

The counted visits for twelve months at its club houses were 47,168; the number of visits paid and received by welfare workers was 8,549; the total school enrollment for 9 months was 305; the average school attendance during 9 months was 161; the total kindergarten enrollment for 9 months was 94; the average kindergarten attendance during 9 months was 46; the number of baths taken in 12 months was 14,361; the number of books from libraries taken home during the same period was 2,569. The final test of the schools and of the other helpful agencies in this village is the degree of improvement produced by them in the health, good order, and cleanliness of the village, and in the thrift, education, efficiency, and good citizenship of the individuals.

An outline of the state of welfare work in South Carolina mill villages would be incomplete without special mention of a splendid body of men and women who began their careers in such work in cotton mill villages in that state. Thus under efficient leadership of international secretaries, the local secretaries of the Young Men's Christian Association and of the Young Women's Christian Association through study and through devotion to high ideals are rendering an invaluable service and making for themselves a noble record of worthy achievement in South Carolina, and from its mill villages are entering numerous industries in other states.

Too much importance has been attached to the fear of "pauperizing" villagers by assisting them. It is hard to see how furnishing teachers and places of instruction can pauperize people when usually each member of the family, except the housekeeper, of 12 years and over works in the mill ten hours daily. And it is hardly to be expected that poor people should build churches or schools to any large extent in the mill corporation's village, which they may desire to leave, or be required to leave, at any time.

While some progress has been made in the developing of successful welfare work in South Carolina, we have yet much to learn about dignifying labor by certain industrial practices and by furnishing fitting surroundings; and there are some promising lines of welfare work which to the present have not been attempted. Among these are systems of long service premiums and sick and death benefits to employees of standing, which incentives, if properly worked out, would all serve other useful purposes in addition to preventing unnecessary moving from mill to mill, and a number of which have been successfully introduced elsewhere by practical corporations, such as the United States Steel Corporation.

It is also to be hoped that in coming years our villages will contain not only agencies paid for by the mill corporations, but also memorial buildings built by directors and large stockholders as public monuments to southern big-hearted generosity and to the genuineness of the good will of the mills to the "men behind the guns" and their families, who according to their ability have often bravely helped in the fight which brought honor and profit to the directors and stockholders.

Such welfare work as has been described blesses giver and receiver; for it builds prosperity on an indestructible foundation of education, peace, and good will, and when united with other necessary good business management must not only be financially profitable, but also must raise manufacturing up to a higher plane than it could otherwise occupy, no matter what its financial success, on account of its voluntary and unselfish social service to its workers, to the community, and to the state.

We love South Carolina and cherish her past; on her the sun of prosperity has shone brightly; she has had many patriots, statesmen, soldiers, divines, scholars, men of affairs, and worthy humbler citizens. The blighting hand of war and "reconstruction" devastated her fair fields and for a period closed her doors of learning; a great sorrow seized upon her and her sun was dimmed; but adversity never subdued the indomitable spirit of her people. They, each in his place, rescued her. Sorrow is fleeing; her doors of learning are opening; her fields are preparing to bloom with a new prosperity, and the lifting mist discloses for the first time her whole territory dotted over with camps of in-

dustry, into which with surprising rapidity stragglers have mobilized into an army. This army has to be trained and perfected; facts are to be faced and seemingly insurmountable difficulties to be overcome that the God of our fathers may be our God and that the safety and greatness of our beloved state may be secured to all generations, not by the might and wealth of a few, but by the education, development, and patriotism of a united people.

The Opportunities and the Obligations of the College.

BY WILLIAM H. HAND,

State High School Inspector in the University of South Carolina.

Every one at all familiar with educational conditions in the South must be keenly conscious of the lack of a unified system of public education, the lack of organization and articulation between the types and grades of educational institutions. This lack of system has served to emphasize the confusion as to the function of each type and grade. There has always been some discussion of the main function of the private secondary school. There is little room for discussion as to the chief function of the public secondary school. The very fact that it is supported by popular taxation almost removes it from the arena of debate as to its main function. An institution supported by taxes levied upon all the people will not long live, nor does it deserve to live, unless it in some tangible way serves all the people. However hackneyed the term, the high school is the people's college. Nearly nine tenths of the high school pupils go directly from it into the activities and responsibilities of life. In it that large and important class of sturdy men and helpful women who never reach the college must get their training for intelligent citizenship, for industrial efficiency, and for social enjoyment.

Although "the secondary school antedates the college by several centuries," the college early in its history assumed a kind of overlordship in the educational territory, especially over the elementary school. (In this discussion the term college is used to embrace both the college and the university.) The college takes commendable pride in reminding the high school that educational light comes from above. So it does; but has that light always been clear and penetrating, and helpful to the high school? Has that overlordship always been wise and beneficent? After long debate the college somewhat reluctantly came to admit that the function of the high school is to prepare pupils for life rather than to prepare them for college. Theoretically, then, the high school is fitting boys and girls for life, while in fact it is still dominated by

college entrance requirements. The merits of the individual high school are measured by college standards. To this less objection might be made, were it demonstrated that practically, philosophically, and psychologically present college standards are the best standards in modern education. But with reference to what is best for the boy and girl in the high school, certainly there is a great lack of agreement. That is the fundamental problem. Settle that first. "If the college entrance requirements do not harmonize with the training that is best suited to the high school period, then those requirements should be changed." Never before in the history of education has the college had a better opportunity for constructive work of the highest order than it has today in reorganizing and readjusting educational standards. Sooner or later we shall have "a complete and unified system of education, founded on psychological and social principles." The work of harmonizing must begin in the elementary school and continue up through the high school into the college. Will the college take advantage of the opportunity?

The college has another opportunity and another obligation. Everybody knows that the war between the sections left the educational machinery of the South paralyzed. Most of the antebellum academies had been swept out of existence, and most of the boys of that period had neither the time nor the money to attend such schools, had they been in existence. Many of the colleges had closed their doors, and when they reopened them they found themselves without students of any kind of reasonable preparation; hence for years the colleges had to do preparatory work in their regular classes. Thus situated the colleges were compelled to maintain low standards and to perform the functions of the secondary school, and in so doing they discharged a duty to the state and to the cause of education for which all of us should be profoundly grateful. However, conditions have changed, and the college must readjust itself to the new conditions. The demand of the people was for better school facilities, and the public high school was the response. That it came after a long struggle is true, but it is firmly fixed as an integral part of a system of public education. The high school is now given state support and local support. It is clamoring not for money for its support, but for room for growth and development. The burden that was once

laid heavily upon the college, the high school is ready and anxious to take up. The opportunity of the college is to get out of the high school territory, and its obligation is to encourage the development of the high school. Will the college take advantage of its opportunity and meet its obligation?

The high school is insisting upon occupying its own legitimate field, and that field is clearly enough defined to leave no cause for contention. Based upon a seven-year elementary school, which is almost universal in the southern states, a secondary school course of four years must be regarded as conservative. The pupil, whether going from the high school into the activities of life and citizenship or on to the college or university, needs at least four years of high school training. In most of the southern states, high schools with regularly established four-year courses and regular four-year pupils are the exception rather than the rule. The development and maintenance of four-year high schools with broad and efficient courses of study depend very materially upon the attitude of the college toward such schools. The college should abandon the high school territory and insist upon the high school's occupying it. Will it do so? Alas! and alack! The college has so long enjoyed the flesh-pots of Egypt that it is unwilling to leave them. One could at least sympathize with the college in this situation, were the college not so inconsistent. For at least ten years, in season and out of season, it has been bemoaning the lack of students prepared for college entrance. The condition which it bemoaned was a reality, and is yet a reality. But what is the college doing to better conditions? Is it setting up reasonably high standards for itself, then requiring students to measure up to those standards? Or, is it setting up paper standards fully up to the limit of the undeveloped high school, then waging a campaign for students from one to two years before they complete the high school course? From the narrow view point of numbers alone such a course is suicidal.

The college undertakes to excuse itself for maintaining low standards for entrance, and for canvassing for half-prepared students, on the untenable ground that there are so many places without adequate high schools, and that the college must accept conditions as they exist. It is true that there are many places without even respectable high schools, but in taking the unpre-

pared pupils the college is hindering such places instead of aiding them. Why should a community trouble itself to maintain a high school, when the college is eager to occupy the field? So long as the college takes the pupils to give them high school training, there will be few good local high schools; those pupils able to go to college will do so, while those unable to go will be compelled to stop school at the end of the elementary course for want of further opportunities. The writer has in his possession scores of letters from high school principals complaining that the colleges rob them of their pupils before they get through the high school. The college's excuse for accepting conditions as they exist is little more than a subterfuge. If conditions are bad (and they are), who is largely responsible for them and whose opportunity is it to better them? The college claims much righteousness in accepting wholly unprepared boys and girls, asserting that it must accept them or permit them to go uneducated. The college is under no moral obligation to accept any such pupil. It would render the pupil as well as the cause of education a positive service by sending him on to some good high school. It would cost the pupil no more, and he would find himself in a school where he would be prepared to do the work. Perhaps the pupil is seeking a college and not a high school. What has that to do with the wisdom of the choice? And what of the college itself? Does not the admission of wholly unprepared students to a college class confirm the charge that the college is competing with the high school? Verily, the college and the high school are rivals.

High-sounding subjects and well-rounded courses in the college catalogue tell but little. The basic question is, where do pupils begin on entering its classes? At the end of four years the student is just four years beyond his entrance. For illustration a certain college has in its catalogue the statement that its curriculum is as high as that of any other college in the South. To the writer's knowledge the public school in the home town of that college has never been able to have more than two years in its high school course. The college is too coy and winsome a rival.

The popular mind has come to look upon the published entrance requirements of many colleges as fictitious, and the popular mind is more than half correct. With a college catalogue

before you, giving its entrance requirements in the staple subjects, such as English, mathematics, history, and Latin, at a standard which you know the undeveloped high school is failing to reach, your mind is likely to be disturbed when you know that that same college is canvassing for students a year before they get through the average high school. It is hard to reconcile these cold facts with the constant wail of the college for better prepared students, and perennial announcements about having raised standards. A few colleges are making heroic efforts to better these conditions, but they are a small minority.

Although the college canvasses for three-year high school pupils and readily accepts two-year pupils, it is usually unwilling to permit a four-year pupil from the same high school to enter the sophomore class. The reason assigned is that the college cannot afford to degrade its standard of scholarship, since the teaching in the high school is inferior to that done in the college. For a college to admit a pupil to its freshman class from the second year of the high school and then refuse to admit to its sophomore class a four-year pupil from the same high school, is absurd. If the teachers in a high school can prepare a boy in two years for the freshman class, it is passing strange that the same teachers in two years more cannot prepare a boy for the sophomore class. Remember that the question is of the quality of the teaching, not of the quantity of work done. Does not the high school teacher teach high school subjects, in the high school way, to pupils of the high school age and advancement, while the college professor is supposed to teach college subjects, in the college way, to students of the college age? If the college admits that its freshman class is a high school, taught as a high school should be taught, its position, so far as the question under discussion goes, is consistent and logical; otherwise, it is illogical and untenable. Some of the evil fruits of this attitude of the college will be noted in the following paragraph.

The college is thoroughly justifiable in declaiming against the inferior teaching in the average high school. Much of it can scarcely be dignified with the name teaching. Yet a careful census reveals the fact that more than ninety per cent. of the high school teachers in South Carolina hold college diplomas. The diplomas come from colleges throughout the southern states. About the

same conditions obtain in the other southern states. Why does the college graduate not do a higher class of teaching in the high school? The answer is not difficult: the college took the pupil almost from the elementary school, almost totally ignorant of the high school branches, rushed him through four or five high school subjects during the freshman year, dosed him with lectures, instead of teaching him, the remainder of the four years, then sent him out to teach in the high school. To be specific, a boy takes one or two books of plane geometry in the high school, goes to college and is carried rapidly through the entire five books, and is told to make up any deficiencies by the end of his freshman year, or, at furthest, the end of his sophomore year. Now, it usually happens that the boy is in the same predicament as to English, history, Latin, and his other mathematics. What is the poor fellow to do? What can he do? He may have had good elementary training, and it is to be hoped that he will get good college training. When is he to get his high school training? He goes back home to join his voice with that juvenile kidnapper, the professional college canvasser, in telling the boys and girls not to waste a year longer in the high school, but to go on to college.

Will the college and the university rise to their opportunity and meet their obligation, or will they permit their mania for numbers to continue to dominate them?

Three Studies of Southern Problems.*

By WILLIAM K. BOYD,

Professor of History in Trinity College.

There are two inherent difficulties in making a valuation of all criticisms and studies relating to the South. One is, that no section of our country is less influenced in a constructive way by suggestions from without; indeed the average native resident of the southern states has a sensitiveness, often amounting to resentment, toward any adverse opinion of conditions around him which emanates from another region or country. The other difficulty is, that knowledge of the origins and development of southern life in the past is still so elementary, and the influences at work today are so complex, that their interpretation requires the divinining mind of the prophet as much as the methods of the institutional or economic historian.

The volumes under review are specific illustrations of these points. Mr. Hart's *Southern South* is a painstaking effort to present the indigenous southern problems of today on the basis of wide reading, long-standing intellectual relations with southern men and women, and extended travels. Its value depends on the accuracy of its details, its sense of perspective, and the author's power to penetrate behind the exterior into the possibilities as well as the passions of human nature. Mr. Archer's *Thro' Afro-America* is primarily the impressions of a tour through parts of the south. Now travels are the most precarious kind of literature. However great their interest to the reader, their value as evidences of normal conditions is almost invariably open to question; in fact, the information given by the traveller is usually cited in quotations or with an intimation that it may not be the whole truth. In contrast to these volumes of Mr. Hart and Mr. Archer is the study of Mr. Odum, the result of intensive research supplemented by wide personal observation. Indeed his work is a Columbia

*The *Southern South*—By Albert Bushnell Hart, New York; D. Appleton & Co., 1910; 445 pp.

Thro' Afro-America—By William Archer, New York; E. P. Dutton & Co., 1910; xvi 295. pp.

Social and Mutual Traits of the Negro—By Howard W. Odum, New York; Columbia University, 1910; 302. pp.

University doctor's dissertation, the style of which is far superior to that of the average book of its kind. His conclusions, though sometimes pedantic, are little open to question and are full of suggestions for all interested in educational or well-fare work among the negroes.

A comparative study of the merits of the first two of these books brings the remarkable conviction that Mr. Archer has a deeper insight into southern life than Mr. Hart, that he realizes better the latent tragedies in its racial problem, and presents more of the normal, dominant spirit of its people. Indeed, he has such power of suggesting profound truth through clear, visualized descriptions that common-place types or conditions have new values when interpreted by him. This contrast is the more remarkable in the light of the preparation of the two authors. Mr. Hart is a native American, of abolition ancestry, a professor in Harvard, who has a genuine desire to understand southern life and traditions. Mr. Archer is English born, and his interest in the South was aroused by discussions of racial problems and their possibilities in the British Empire. Is this contrast in power of interpretation accidental, or an example of a closer kinship of the South to English institutions than to abolition blood?

A specific illustration of this divergence is their view of the nature and cause of racial antagonism. Mr. Hart makes the following statement, which should be accepted by all southern people as the conclusion of the North concerning the parity of the races: "Measuring it by the white people of the south, or by the correspondingly low population of Southern and Northern cities, the negroes as a people appear to be considerably below the whites in mental and moral status . . . Race measured by race, the negro is inferior, and his past history in Africa and in America leads to the belief that he will remain inferior in race stamina and race achievement."

But, granting the racial superiority of the white, Mr. Hart cannot understand that frenzy of racial antipathy aroused by the issue of social equality. "Here is one of the mysteries of the subject which the northern mind cannot penetrate. Southern society, so proud, so exclusive, so efficient in protecting itself from the undesired, is in terror lest it should be found admitting the fearful curse of social equality; and there are plenty of Southern

writers who insist that the negro shall be deprived of the use of public conveyances, of education, of a livelihood, lest he, the weak, the despised, force social equality upon the white race. What is social equality if not a mutual feeling in a community that each member is welcome to the social intercourse of the other? How is the negro to obtain social equality so long as the white man refuses to invite him or to be invited with him? It sounds like a joke!"

The query of Mr Hart is graphically answered by the argument of Mr. Archer. Discussing the racial antipathy of the southern white toward the black, he says: "I believe that, however unwise in much of her talk and actions, the South is in the main animated by a just and far feeling, if not far seeing, instinct. That there has been an infinitude of tragic unwisdom in the matter, not in the South alone, no one nowadays denies. But I believe that the problem, far from being unreal, is so real and so dishearteningly difficult that nothing but an almost superhuman wisdom, energy, and courage will effectively deal with it."

The basis of this "far feeling instinct," he says, is two-fold. The southern states, by location, climate, and resources are fitted for a white man's land. "They were explored, settled, organized by white men; by white men their liberties were vindicated. They are fitted by their climate and resources to be not only a white man's land, but one of the greatest white man's lands in the world. The black man came there only as a (terribly ill-chosen) tool for their development. When the tool ceases to be a tool and claims a third part of the heritage, the "peripeteia" is no doubt dramatic and exceedingly moral, but none the less exasperating to a generation which, after all, was personally innocent of the original crime-blunder. No one enjoys playing the scape-goat in a moral apologue; and the Southern man would be more than human if he accepted the part with perfect equanimity." Add to this economic cause one based on biology. "The upshot," he says, "is that in a magnificent country, well outside the torrid zone, and eminently suited to be the home of a white race, one person in every three is coloured, and one person in every four is undistinguishable from an African savage. It would be the extravagance of paradox to maintain that this is a positively desirable condition, preferable to that of a country which presents a normal uniform-

ity of complexion. . . . A monochrome civilization is on the face of it preferable to such a piebald civilization as at present exists in the Southern States . . . The ultimate forces at war in the South are the instinctive, half conscious desire of the black race to engraft itself on the white stock, and the no less instinctive horror of the white stock at such a surrender of its racial integrity. This horror is all the more acute—all the more morbid, if you will—because the white race is conscious of its own frailty, and knows that it is, in some sense, fighting a battle against perfidious nature. It is a hard thing to say, but I have little doubt it is true, that much of the injustice and cruelty to which the negro is subjected in the South is a revenge, not so much for sexual crime on the negro's part, as for an uneasy conscience or consciousness on the part of the whites. It is because the black race inevitably appeals to one order of low instincts in the white, that it suffers from the sympathetic stimulation of another order of low instincts."

Nowhere, in all the literature of the racial problem, is a bolder, clearer statement of the cause of racial antipathy and the dark truths behind social equality agitation.

Mr. Archer's superior perception of southern conditions, however, is not limited to racial antagonism. Some of his impressions of negro life penetrate into the very core of human character. Thus he found a talk with a negro lawyer "curiously like the talk which a sixteenth-century Englishman might have held with a Spanish or Venetian Jew. . . . The ever-recurring burden of his tale was a celebration of the material progress of his race, the wealth they were amassing, the homes they were founding, the heroism they were developing in the teeth of adverse circumstance." Again, in visiting negro homes he was struck, not so much with their comforts or luxuries, as by a sense "that (with one or two exceptions) these homes were not homes at all. I do not doubt that each roof sheltered a home; but I do not believe that the prim parlours I saw had any essential connection with it. They were no more home-like than the shop-window rooms of the up-to-date upholsterer. If they were lived in at all, it was from a sense of duty, a self-conscious effort after a life of 'refinement.' They were, in short, entirely imitative and mechanical tributes to the American ideal of the prosperous, cultivated home.

I could find in them no real expression of the individuality of their inhabitants." Nowhere in Mr. Hart's array of facts can there be found such a cogent summary of the real tragedy of the negro, who is forced to work out his destiny in the shadow of a civilization which he copies but does not absorb.

In treating the working relations between the two races, neither Mr. Archer nor Mr. Hart reaches all the truth. This is especially notable in their consideration of justice. When did the scales of the blind deity ever balance truly between wealth and poverty, the native and the alien? But Mr. Hart's account of the brutality of a collector for a cheap clothing store toward a delinquent negro debtor is surely an extreme type of racial injustice; in fact the story is too lurid even to make good literature. Why not balance against the open injustice done to the negro the thousands of petty crimes he commits, known to the whites, for which he is not prosecuted on account of tolerance rather than desire for uninterrupted labor? Nor in the discussions of mob law are allowances made for the tendency toward localization of lynchings, or the successful efforts of officials to prevent the meeting out of popular vengeance. Mr. Hart, also Mr. Archer to a less degree, does not sufficiently discount the radical language used by many white men when "interviewed" about the negro. Often sensitiveness to criticism from without is so great that violent words may conceal a naturally generous, sympathetic heart.

Mr. Archer alone presents a definite solution of racial questions. That is nothing less than the political segregation of the negro—"the formation of a new state which should be, not a white man's land, but a black man's land." His argument is based on the never-ending biological stress produced by two races living in propinquity and the impossibility of Booker Washington's ideal of absolute social separation along with industrial cooperation. The negro, he believes, would thus gain a chance to vindicate his claim "to the rights and liberties of civilized humanity"; the South, freed "from the legacy of ancestral crime, would awaken, as from a nightmare, to the realization of its splendid destiny". The practical difficulties in the way of such a solution are too great to be presented here. Indeed, no formula ever offered will bring about a perfect adjustment of racial relations. That must come as an unforeseen unfolding of destiny. But the spirit that

must guide in all constructive effort is that of the intelligent, humane, working white man, a spirit revealed to Mr. Archer by the following words of an industrial leader at Birmingham: "I feel that these people (negroes) have been left on our hands through no fault of their own, and that it is our duty to do the best we can for them, each in his own way. It is the business of some people to think out theoretical questions; but that is not my business. I try to do what practical good I can from day to day—and that keeps my hands pretty full. . . . Solutions will be found for many problems that now seem terribly difficult, if both races will only have patience. You know

'God worketh in mysterious ways,
His wonders to perform!'

"Many whites in the South have hitherto held aloof from the negro cause, because they felt that the negro regarded them with suspicion and preferred to look for help to the North. That feeling is now passing away on both sides."

It is a relief to turn from these volumes to Mr. Odum's monograph. In contrast to Mr. Hart's argument, statistics, and observations, and the sombre tragedy of life portrayed by Mr. Archer, he presents an analysis of the leading phases of negro life. The school, the church, the home, social organizations, and social status are described with the cleverness of personal observation and the authority of definite investigations. For those residing in the South, no new facts or tendencies are disclosed, but the organization of material gives a strong conception of the characteristics of negro civilization. Worthy of attention are the suggestions for text books adopted to the special mental and racial qualities of the negro and further cooperation of the whites in the religious life of the colored man. More investigations of this kind are needed before intelligent, effective efforts can be made to help the race to its unforeseen destiny.

Unfortunately, in discussions of the South racial adjustment usually overshadows all other questions. The southern white man, the greatest factor in securing results, is too often lost sight of. It is therefore eminently fitting that Mr. Hart should devote the larger part of his volume to the blood and works of the Caucasian. Here, however, his book is lacking in thorough investigation and that divining sympathy which catches the

spirit behind the facts. By way of illustration, his researches have not removed the popular fancy that "not a single Southern state had organized and set in operation a system" of free rural schools before the civil war and that "one of the benefits conferred by the Reconstruction governments was a system of general public schools nominally open to every child in city or county". Certainly a careful study of state history would reveal the establishment of educational funds and the opening of schools for the rural whites before 1860. Also, Mr. Hart's appreciation of the historical sense in the South is too low. The investigation of traditions and institutions has undoubtedly brought a more liberal attitude among the people toward the past. The article in this issue of *The Quarterly* by Samuel A. Ashe is enough to quash his dictum that those who do not believe in the Mecklenburg Declaration "had better live somewhere else than in North Carolina". An even greater mistake is his view of the southern attitude toward secession. No one would champion secession as a constitutional remedy for the present or the future. But may it not have been something more than a conviction in the past? May it not have been widely accepted as constitutional? Was it not at least a logical conclusion from the political theories of the "fathers"? This is the present southern feeling toward secession; but Mr. Hart, a professional historian, makes the following fiat: "To justify the doctrine of secession now would mean to pull out the bracing of the Union, no part of which is more determined to be a portion of the great and powerful American nation than the Southern States. It can hardly be expected that the North, after sacrificing five hundred thousand lives and four billions of treasure, will, half a century later, come round to the point of view of the defeated section." With such partisan views on matters of government, Mr. Hart naturally does not consider the possibility of a strong anti-southern frenzy after the war, and that its victims may have been Captain Wirz and those who suffered for the death of President Lincoln.

Other examples of Mr. Hart's faulty reasoning might be given. But when errors of fact and judgment are all removed, there still remains a lack of vision into the soul of the aspiring, working South, with its heritage of conflicting social and political influences and its potentiality of tragedy or success in the future. For

these defects every reader must feel a keen sense of regret; for there are in the book an evident desire to be just, a striving to understand certain questions, and an endorsement of some southern convictions which clearly indicate that the day for cooperative effort by all Americans in the interest of all sections is at hand. Scientific investigation, much of it, and a vision of things as they appeal to the southern temperament are also needed as a basis for united work.

The Influence of Industrial and Educational Leaders on the Secession of Virginia.

BY HENRY G. ELLIS.

In studying the history of any given period, too much stress is apt to be laid on the political leader, who all too frequently follows instead of leads. The reason for this is obvious. The political leader is the representative of the people, the mouth-piece of his constituents. Through him the general will is made known and preserved in a form readily accessible to the historian. For this reason his influence seems to be greater than it really is, and is correspondingly emphasized. The work of the industrial and educational leader is done more quietly. But it precedes, not follows, the expression of the general will. It is this type of leader who in the quiet of every-day life is unobtrusively directing the thought and moulding the ideas and opinions of the masses. It is this type of leader who carefully prepares the tinder which will later require but the merest spark to burst into flame and start a conflagration which may require the blood of war to extinguish it.

For evidence of this we have but to look at the history of some of the great upheavals of recent history. The French Revolution did not come until Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu and many others of their kind had carefully and consistently drilled their principles and teachings into the minds of the French public. It would be indeed difficult to measure the influence of the active pamphleteering that preceded the American Revolution or to gauge the effect that it had in arousing the spirit of resistance. As this is true of these great political crises so is it true that the industrial and educational leaders had great weight in bringing the two great opposing sections of the United States to refer their differences to the decision of war.

This is particularly true in the case of Virginia. She was a border state with strongly conflicting interests and with decided sectional differences. Too far north to be one of the cotton states, the same economic reasons which so largely influenced the states

of the lower south to secession did not work so strongly in Virginia, although it cannot be denied that they did play a part, and an important one, in determining her final decision. Slavery played no insignificant part in the politics of this state. Although many of the large slave-holders of the eastern part of the state were following the teachings of Jefferson and emancipating their slaves, in some rare cases even providing for their maintenance after they were freed, still the fact remains that the eastern part of the state was strongly pro-slavery, and the pro-slavery sentiment in this section steadily increased after the demand for slaves in the lower south began to make their breeding and selling a profitable employment in Virginia. On the other hand the western part of the state was much inclined towards abolition. There were important economic reasons for this intra-state dissimilitude. The east was the home of the large planters, the wealthy, aristocratic, and conservative element of the population. The west was the home of the pioneer, the man who had with his own hands built a home for himself in the wilderness. The country itself, largely mountainous, was not adapted to extensive farms, and slavery had never had the opportunity to gain the same strong foothold that it had in the east. With the approach of the acrimonious discussion that preceded disunion the divergent interests of the two sections had been clearly shown, and in things political, things social, and things religious, a line of demarkation was gradually being drawn between east and west, pro-slavery and anti-slavery, aristocrat and pioneer democrat.

Each section had its industrial and educational leaders. For years Thomas R. Dew, as professor in William and Mary College, had carefully trained his political economy students in the doctrine of free trade. When the slavery question began to eclipse the national interest in the tariff, he entered actively into the field of the pamphleteer to defend the institution of negro slavery and to vindicate the slave-holding section of Virginia. After the Southampton Insurrection he was especially active. His articles were presented to the public through the agency of the newspapers and periodicals of the time. In 1833 his *Essay on Slavery* appeared in pamphlet form. From this time until his death, in 1848, Thomas R. Dew was consistently and powerfully defending slavery as a beneficial economic institution and a great social

blessing. He commanded a large and intelligent audience, and his works were read with avidity and eagerly adopted by many of the slave-holders of the entire South.

The great exponent of the west was also a prominent educator. In 1847 the Rev. Henry Ruffner, D. D., at the earnest solicitation of John Letcher and ten other prominent western Virginians, published in pamphlet form *An Address* which he had delivered at Lexington. This was the famous *Ruffner Pamphlet*, and it became, to a large extent, the gospel of the west. Anti-slavery men eagerly accepted it, and it was especially pleasing to those who had advocated the abolishment of slavery for purely economic reasons. Ruffner did not, as did so many of the radical abolitionists of the North, denounce slavery as a sin and a moral curse. But, as he himself said, the question of the moral right or wrong was not raised. As an economist he denounced the institution as an economic evil and advocated its abolishment for economic reasons. In what is now the state of West Virginia, and in the Valley section of Virginia, the pamphlet was well received. In the east it met with malediction and contempt.

Following the Ruffner pamphlet the east found a new leader, this time not an educational but an industrial representative, a man of the people, a practical planter and slave-holder. For years Edmund Ruffin had been an agricultural prophet and priest for the eastern section of the United States. His authority in agricultural matters had become recognized from New England to Georgia. All his farming ventures had been highly successful, and he had grown rich under the system of negro slavery. He was a prolific writer on agricultural matters, and this training, coupled with long experience as an editor, enabled him to defend his views with clear and convincing reasoning and in intelligible terms. The growing importance of the slavery question and the increased agitation for abolition induced him to turn his talents as a publicist in that direction.

In December, 1856, he published in the *Richmond Enquirer* an *Essay on the Causes and Consequences of the Independence of the South*. This was followed in 1857 by a pamphlet entitled *The Political Economy of Slavery or The Institution considered in regard to its influence on Public Wealth and the General Welfare*, and in that same year by another pamphlet, *Consequences of*

Abolition Agitation. In 1859 *African Colonization Unveiled* and *The Colonization Society and Liberia* appeared. In 1860 Mr. Ruffin published a four hundred page book called *Anticipations of the Future to serve as lessons for the present time*. All of these articles and books were strongly pro-slavery and pro-southern. From the slave-holder's point of view they enlarged and strengthened the arguments advanced by Prof. Dew. They defended slavery as an economic, social, and moral benefit; they attacked the Colonization Society and all actively connected therewith; they denounced the abolitionists as lying hypocrites masquerading under the mask of religion and philanthropy, but "actuated much less by love for the slaves than by hatred of their masters"; they made a plea for a united, slave-holding South, and in no uncertain terms they advocated and urged secession as the only means of remedying the political conditions of the time.

Mr. Ruffin's admirers were legion. As an industrial leader and as an agricultural writer, he had attracted and held the attention of thousands of readers, and these loyal followers read with eagerness the expressions of the political views of a man who had so successfully proven his theories in more practical matters and who had done so much to improve the farming element of his country. That he was a great factor in forming the views and convictions of many of the planters of eastern Virginia and of the entire South can scarcely be doubted. As the debates grew warmer and the line of separation began to be more clearly drawn, he left the field of the pamphleteer for that of the stump-speaker, and during the few months that immediately preceded the war he went about from convention to convention, dressed in homespun and with the war-time cockade in his hat, preaching secession as the panacea for the ills of the country.

Space does not permit the recording of many more such publicists who, following in the footsteps of these greater lights, from 1850 to 1860 kept the presses busy turning off pamphlets for or against slavery, in favor of, and opposed to, secession. Preachers in the pulpits, professors in the college halls, editors in their offices, speakers on the stump, private citizens in their studies were all absorbed in one great question and were flooding the nation with pro- and anti-literature. And whichever side they took, whatever views they expressed, it was but to hasten the Great Conflict.

In studying the history of the war of 1860 and in seeking to understand the influences that served to bring on this conflict we must go behind the oratory of the political speaker, we must go further back than to the proceedings of our state and national legislatures, and take into account the unobtrusive work of the pamphleteer. He was most frequently a man of the people and a man to whom the people gladly listened, and his work was none the less important because it was unobtrusive and because much of it has been suffered to fall into oblivion. His share in bringing the people of Virginia to the point of secession, even at the cost of half her domain, was by no means small or inconsiderable.

The Legislatures of the States.

By BERNARD C. STEINER

Librarian of the Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Md.

In our federal system of government we have divided the subjects of legislation and, granting some of them to the national Congress, have reserved the remainder for the consideration of the general assemblies of the states. These general assemblies are in direct historical continuity with the provincial assemblies of colonial days and, in the period between the Declaration of Independence and the adoption of the present federal constitution, were practically the only bodies which set internal laws for the citizens of the states. The coming of the stronger federal union produced by the United States Constitution lessened the influence and importance of state legislatures, and the increasing dominance of national affairs has still further lessened their importance in later years. Yet a great field of taxation and legislation is still left them, and the average citizen fails to realize how great are the powers of his state's general assembly. One of our leading historical writers has remarked that almost every important question of internal politics which agitated the British Parliament in the 19th century was one which would have been decided by the state legislatures in our system of government.

The breadth of the powers remaining in these bodies is shown in the summary given in the Statesman's Year Book for 1906. Among the powers of the state legislatures "are the determination of the qualifications for the right of suffrage and the control of all elections to public office, including elections of members of Congress and electors of President and Vice-President; the criminal law, both in its enactment and in its execution, with unimportant exceptions, and the administration of prisons; the civil law, including all matters pertaining to the possession and transfer of and succession to property; marriage and divorce, and all other civil relations; the chartering and control of all manufacturing, trading, transportation, and other corporations, subject only to the right of Congress to regulate commerce passing from one

State to another; the regulation of labor; education; charities; licensing, including regulation of the liquor traffic; fisheries and game laws."

Bodies so important in their history and so extensive in their powers are worthy of careful study and of the best thought of the people, so that more efficient work may be accomplished by them. Yet we find a prevailing neglect of the state legislatures and, on the part of many people, a feeling of mingled disgust and contempt for them. They are spoken of as necessary evils. Recent state constitutions have shown a growing distrust of the state legislatures, have prevented them from passing special laws upon certain subjects, and have changed their sessions from annual to biennial and, in two cases, to quadrennial, thus getting far away from the old feeling that elections needed to be frequent. It has been found difficult to procure men of the first rank to go into the legislatures, and the people show in many ways that they have not the high opinion of the lawmaking bodies that should exist. Since these things are so, this article attempts a survey of the general assemblies of the states in their genesis and in their present organization and functions with the hope that, in pointing out some of the defects in these assemblies, the criticism will not be merely destructive, but may also indicate means for betterment and reconstruction, so that a restoration of public confidence may follow.

When Queen Elizabeth gave Sir Walter Raleigh in 1584 that charter which constitutes the first important step of the English colonization of North America, she granted to him and to his heirs and assigns forever to discover, occupy and enjoy any "remote heathen and barbarous lands, countries, and territories, not actually possessed of any Christian prince nor inhabited by Christian people", and, because the people of these new lands were heathen and barbarous, she further granted him the right to govern all Englishmen, who should come into these countries of Raleigh's dominion, "according to such statutes, laws, and ordinances" as he may devise, provided that all these laws be "agreeable to the form of the laws, statutes, government, and policy of England". There was no thought here, nor anywhere in the England of the 16th century, of colonial self-government. Grants of proprietary rights in countries hitherto possessed by

no Christian nation were not only made to favorites of the court, but also to trading companies, which, not content with such monopoly of trade as the Muscovy Company enjoyed with Christian Russia, asked for right of jurisdiction over Englishmen in lands inhabited by pagans with which they traded whether these lands were inhabited by powerful peoples, as was India, or were *hactenus inculta*, as was North America with its thin population of scattered Indian tribes. Territorial limits, however, had to be put to the jurisdiction of these companies, and no more roving commissions could be issued, so, in 1606, the Virginia Companies received a charter, with broad boundaries it is true, but still with boundaries within which the "knights, gentlemen, merchants, and other adventurers" in the English towns who formed the two companies should have jurisdiction through a council, which "should govern the colonies according to such laws as be made" therefor by the king.

Another provision of the charter amplified a grant made to Raleigh and assured all persons, subjects of the king of England who may dwell in the plantations, that they should "have and enjoy all liberties", as if "they had been abiding and born within this our realm of England". Under this charter Jamestown was settled and Popham's colony failed, but in neither was there provision for colonial self-government, though dire need made the Virginians seize some share of it. The second Virginia charter, that of 1609, established a council resident in England as the governing body of the corporation and empowered it to make laws necessary for the government of the colony. This council, or board of directors as we should call it, was established because of the inconvenience of frequent meetings to the adventurers or stockholders. The charter granted to the Virginia Company in 1612 provided for "four great and general courts of the Council and Company of Adventurers for Virginia" in every year, the importance of which stockholders meetings is well known in English history. The control of the company came into the hands of the country or liberal party in England, and we feel little surprise to be told that, under their rule, a House of Burgesses "broke out" in Virginia in 1619. The settlers had become agriculturists and were scattered along the tidewater rivers, and, with true English pertinacity, they objected to paying taxes without voting them

by their own representatives. When the king took the charter from the Virginia Company in 1624, he left the House of Burgesses in the colony. From the very first, the governor sent from England to administer the colony had a council with him for advisory purposes, and this body, for which the common name in some colonies, as in Maryland, was the privy council, easily took the position of the upper house of a legislature in which the House of Burgesses was the lower.

The patent of the Council for New England in 1620 contained no hint of colonial self government, and such a permissive colony as Plymouth, whose small population for a number of years permitted government by primary assembly, was of little importance as a precedent. But in the charter of Avalon in New Foundland, granted Sir George Calvert by James I on April 7, 1623, is found the first definite establishment of a colonial legislative assembly by English law. A palatinate, like that of the Bishop of Durham, was created by this charter, and among the provisions is one that Calvert may make laws for his province "with the advice, assent, and approbation of the freeholders of the said Province, or the greater part of them, whom, for the enacting of the said laws, when and as often as need shall require, we will that the said Sir George Calvert and his heirs shall assemble, in such form as to him shall seem best." When Calvert had become Baron of Baltimore and, disgusted with the barrenness and coldness of his island province, received in 1632 a richer one to the southward, he had the same provision incorporated into the charter of Maryland. The provision was made broader, however, by the substitution of freemen for freeholders.

Durham was not represented in the English parliament until 1673, and in earlier times the Bishop had held assemblies of his tenants, which assemblies exercised certain powers of taxation and legislation. Lapsley states that "The Bishop had his *concilium intimum*, composed of his household, the officers of the palatinate, and certain other persons, and this body was present at the meetings of the assembly, but there is no reason to believe that there was any bi-cameral arrangement." Lord Baltimore was a Yorkshire man, and doubtless the traditions in Durham were familiar to him and his family. We are not surprised, therefore, to find that Cecil, the second Lord Baltimore, provided

in the first settlement of Maryland for primary assemblies of the freemen as legislative bodies. Personal writs of summons were issued to certain prominent settlers to act as the Governor's councillors, and all persons present voted together under the presidency of the Governor. Proxies were allowed from the beginning, and the spread of the colonists over the province soon led to a system of representation, at first of hundreds and later of counties. Those personally summoned as counsellors were separated from the representatives of the other freemen at an early date, and a statute definitely divided the assembly into two houses.

Three years before the charter of Maryland, the first charter of Massachusetts Bay had passed the seals. It established a trading company, modelled upon the Virginia one, with the name of "The Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay". The name "Governor" was substituted for "Treasurer" as the title of the presiding officer, and the directors were called "Assistants" instead of "Councillors". These assistants met monthly, while the general court of freemen, or stockholders, met quarterly as in the Virginia charter. The place of the company's meetings, the home office as we should call it, was omitted, so that it was easily possible to remove the whole corporation to America and settle it on the lands granted in Massachusetts Bay. This removal made the settlers freemen of the company and, as these settlers scattered into a number of towns, representatives for each town came to the General Courts and held proxies for their fellow townsmen.

Americans have always favored bicameral bodies, and, in Massachusetts as in all other colonies, the Assistants, or council, soon sat as a house separate from the representatives of the freemen or burgesses. The fundamental orders of Connecticut in 1639—"the first written Constitution known to history that created a government"—and the charter of Connecticut in 1662 mark still another step in the development of legislative bodies in the American colonies. By the former of these documents it was ordered that "there shall be yearly two general Assemblies of Courts" at which shall be chosen a governor and magistrates and in which the governor, magistrates, and four freemen, sent as deputies from each of the three river towns, had powers of tax-

ation and of legislation. The charter of Connecticut virtually confirmed the Fundamental Orders, changing the names of the magistrates to assistants and reducing the number of deputies from each town in the colony to two. Four years after the Fundamental Orders, another full recognition of the right of colonial self-government was granted Roger Williams and his associates in Warwick's Patent of Providence Plantations which stated that the settlers might have "full power and authority to rule themselves . . . by such form of civil government, as by voluntary consent of all, or the greater part of them, they shall find most suitable to their estate and condition". Thus the development of the colonial legislature was complete, and in a comparatively short time we find the principle acknowledged that a representative assembly of the settlers, joined with a smaller house of councillors or assistants to the governor, shall form the colonial legislature.

The colonial governor, whether deputy of the king or of a lord proprietary, representative or head of a trading corporation, or elected leader of the settlers, was the chief executive officer, usually sitting in the upper house of a bicameral legislature. It happened thereafter that the grant of New York, which had not enjoyed representative institutions under Dutch rule, was made to the Duke of York without provision for a legislature; but, as Englishmen settled there, they demanded the privileges they saw enjoyed in other colonies, and so before the 18th century began there was a great uniformity of system throughout the colonies.

When the first steps were taken toward independence, it looked for a time as if there were a turning to a unicameral legislative system. The provincial conventions, which took the place in popular support of the legislatures which the royal governors prorogued or refused to summon, were of one house, and the Councils of Safety, which conducted business in the interims between conventions, were executive committees of these bodies giving up their powers to the conventions whenever these larger gatherings assembled. When the royal governor fled, his council disappeared; what need was there, then, of more than one house? So argued many, among them Franklin, and several of the state legislatures were organized with but one house, as has more recently been done in some of the Canadian provinces. But nowhere was

it proposed to abolish the governorship, and the arguments for the bicameral system, among which was the familiar one of the coffee cooling by being poured from cup to saucer, were so strong that the majority of state constitutions provided for bicameral legislatures from the first, and the rest long ago were changed so as to provide for two houses. One change worthy of note was made. The Governor nowhere, except in Rhode Island, sat in the upper house, and, except in three of the New England states, he was nowhere provided with a council distinct from the upper house of the legislature, which, with a reminiscence of the great influence of the Roman council of elders, has in every state been called the senate.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

BOOK REVIEWS

THE NEW LAOOKOON. AN ESSAY ON THE CONFUSION OF THE ARTS. By Irving Babbitt. Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company 1910,—xi., 259 pp.

In his earlier book entitled *Literature and the American College*, Mr. Babbitt showed himself to be an interesting if not profound thinker and a gifted and promising writer. His second volume, *The New Laokoon*, well sustains this reputation in both respects. It is without doubt one of the most valuable books of literary criticism that has appeared in America in a long time, and it is written in a most pleasing and rather distinguished style. While he cannot be said to have achieved in it a complete and closed system, he certainly has scattered the *fermenta cognitionis*. Readers of these two books will look forward with interest to the appearance of the promised volume by Mr. Babbitt on Rousseau and Romanticism. He certainly has an intimate knowledge of French critical literature, and seems well acquainted with modern French and English literature. His researches, therefore, into the influence of Rousseauism should prove most interesting. He does not show intimate knowledge of Goethe in his second book, since he fails on several occasions to cite him when he could have well done so to sustain some of his contentions. In fact, Mr. Babbitt has little to say of German literature of a later day than the Romanticists.

That Mr. Babbitt has made a careful study of the history of his subject is made clear enough in the first part of his volume, which he calls "The Pseudo-classic Confusion of the Arts". Indeed, this part of his work makes of it more than one might suspect it to be from the title. It is not merely a supplement for the modern man to Lessing's famous eighteenth century work. He takes exception to parts of Lessing's conclusions, and accuses him of having failed to recognize the real origin of the confusion of the arts. It is in the second part, however, that we are most interested: "The Romantic Confusion of the Arts."

To say the least, Mr. Babbitt is bold in the task he has seriously undertaken,—that of criticizing all the various art activities of the last century. The reader at times doubts his

competency, as, for example, when he undertakes to discuss modern music. In fact, he does not impress one as able to swing his subject fully, and at times allows his interest in some unessential details to lead him afield. At times, too, he betrays both conceit and pedantry. On the whole, however, he shows admirable seriousness and judgment, and his conclusions are for the most part sound and acceptable. He realizes that such "an inquiry into the nature of the *geares* and the boundaries of the arts . . . involves one's attitude not merely to literature but life". For to him literature and art furnish the best insight into the life and character of their time, in that they are but the expression of that life. And so the literary standards that the individual man adheres to go far towards shaping his character. It is with such a serious conviction that he urges a careful consideration of his subject. Humanist that he is, he would have us turn from romanticism and its humanitarian sentimentality in literature that has thrown discredit on both literature and art. In the spread of this impressionism he holds that "literature has lost standards and discipline, and at the same time virility and seriousness". We should cease getting our intellectual culture and standards from the expansive, vague, indefinite nineteenth century, which is but the natural result of Rousseauism in art standards. We need to restore the intellect to its proper place before we can rediscover the path to creative literature and art; to clear the romantic twilight with the pure rays of intellect in order that "we might have once more a type of writing that is not primarily intended for women and men in their unmasculine moods". As a rescue from this pitiable state into which we have fallen Mr. Babbitt urges the divine laws of measure, restraint, and clear-cut distinction of the Greeks, the laws that are exemplified in all their great art and literature.

W. H. WANNAMAKER.

LIVES OF THE BISHOPS OF NORTH CAROLINA FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EPISCOPATE IN THAT STATE DOWN TO THE DIVISION OF THE DIOCESE. By Marshall DeLancey Haywood, Historiographer of the Diocese of North Carolina. Raleigh: Alfred Williams & Co., 1910 270 pp.

Mr. Haywood, whose study of Governor Tryon won for him an abiding place in the literature of North Carolina history, has

made in the present volume a worthy contribution to ecclesiastical knowledge. The Episcopal church, established in North Carolina in colonial days, did not there make progress similar to that in Virginia and South Carolina. The episcopate was not established until 1823, though there was an election without consecration in 1807. There were four incumbents of the office down to 1883, whose lives and labors are told by Mr. Haywood. To the general reader, not the details of their office, but certain large influences reflected in their work are of most interest. Among these is the fact that all four bishops were called to North Carolina from other states,—two from Virginia, one from New York, and one from California. The catholicity of the denomination in North Carolina could have no better example than this free intercourse in official matters with other sections during years when sectional controversies were rending many American churches. Also there was much interest in the religious instruction of slaves; in many parishes the negroes formed a majority of the communicants; in some instances special chapels were erected for them. Bishop Atkinson, who came from Virginia, was typical of the anti-slavery feeling of the old South. He was opposed to the institution, but saw no way of ending it; with abolition he had no sympathy and refused an earlier call to the diocese of Indiana on account of the radical attitude toward slavery in the middle west. As the leader of the church in North Carolina, he recommended attention to the religious needs of the slaves and often preached to them. After the war he also recommended negro clergy for the freedmen, but schools superintended by the whites; one result was the establishment of St. Augustine's school, Raleigh, N. C., which has always had a white Episcopal clergyman at its head. Here is a splendid example of that movement for cooperation of the southern white and the negro in education and religion just after the war.

The early efforts of the Episcopal church in North Carolina for the education of the whites are also described by Mr. Haywood. But there are no statistics of the growth of the church in membership, property, and religious activities. It is to be hoped that all activities of the diocese will be the object of investigation by Mr. Haywood in his work as historiographer, an office he assumed in 1909.

WM. K. BOYD.

GOVERNMENTAL ACTION FOR SOCIAL WELFARE. By Jeremiah W. Jenks.
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910,—xvi., 226 pp.

This volume contains the Kennedy Lectures for 1907-1908 delivered by Professor Jenks before the New York School of Philanthropy. The author has not undertaken to make a study of existing laws for the correction and prevention of social evils. He has rather aimed to give such an account of the powers and practices of the various departments of government as will assist social workers by indicating the best methods of seeking and utilizing the aid of the government. The resulting discussion is enriched from the wide experience gained by Professor Jenks in varied and successful work for social welfare under governmental auspices. Legislators, executive officers, and advocates of social reforms will find that these pages abound with a practical wisdom which should commend the lectures to their thoughtful attention.

In speaking of the attitude of the public toward the decisions of our higher courts, Professor Jenks says (on page 212): "Although there have been hostile criticisms at times against some of our lower courts, almost never have our courts of final appeal in the various states, or the United States courts, been subjected to criticism." Is not this too sweeping a statement? Professor Jenks himself says in the same chapter (page 201): "The decisions of the final courts of appeal in the interpretation of eight-hour labor laws or laws restricting the labor of women and children and of those defining the conditions under which laborers must work in different states, have been the subject of frequent criticism, usually because it has been felt that the courts have attempted to thwart the will of the people as expressed in the legislature." Former President Roosevelt has recently criticized the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the "Knight Sugar Trust case" as well as in the "New York Bake-Shop case", and has said that "such decisions, if consistently followed up, would upset our whole system of popular government". It should be noted, however, that this particular criticism has been uttered since the publication of Professor Jenks's book. The reviewer remembers reading in journals of wide circulation and influence severe criticisms of the action of the higher courts of California and Missouri in reversing on technical grounds con-

victions of bribe takers and corrupt public officers. Have not criticisms of the higher courts been made with increasing freedom in recent years?

W. H. G.

HISTORY OF RECONSTRUCTION IN LOUISIANA (THROUGH 1868). By John Rose Ficklen. (Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series xxviii, No. 1.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1910,—234 pp.

The reconstruction epoch has produced such a hold on the intellectual interests of our time that a new study in the field has come to be one of the routine announcements of each season. One result has been to give an organized conception of the correlation of federal politics and local conditions in the South. Another result has been to widen the conviction that reconstruction was not only a mistake in itself, but a supreme test of the southern white man's determination and fitness to rule in spite of all odds and opposition. Therefore to the reviewer of such monographs as the present the principal interests are largely the incidents of reconstruction policies in their local administration, the comparison of forces as they operated in various states, and the specific heritage of economic or political results.

Louisiana was the first state of the Confederacy in which influences toward rehabilitation in the Union were effective. In 1862 an election was held within the federal lines and two Congressmen were sent to Washington who secured their seats. Immediately parties were formed in Louisiana, but the strong hand of General Banks guided the organization of civil government under Lincoln's ten-percent-plan. While conservatism dominated the constitutional reforms of the convention of 1864, the expenses of that body were extravagant, resembling those of the carpet-bag legislature of South Carolina. Both Lincoln and Johnson recognized the new regime in Louisiana, but its senators and representatives were denied admission to Congress. The state organization continued intact until the reconstruction acts of 1867.

One of the most prominent problems of the administration was the regulation of labor. It was the Union commanders, not the southern whites, who first undertook the task. Under General Butler ex-slaves worked for wages, superintended by military authority. General Banks in a series of proclamations estab-

lished rules that resemble a "black code". Then came the Freedmen's Bureau in 1865. Hoping to relieve themselves of its supervision, the native whites enacted a series of laws concerning labor. These were much more liberal than they were represented to be in the North, and are far different from the accounts of them given in some of the memoirs of the time. They discriminated against the negro only in the matter of suffrage; indeed the vagrant law was modelled on that of Massachusetts and was approved by a Unionist governor who had voluntarily emancipated his slaves. The only evidence of resistance to the results of the war in 1865 was the ratification of the thirteenth amendment with the condition "that any attempt on the part of Congress to legislate otherwise upon the political status or civil relations of former slaves within any state would be a violation of the Constitution of the United States".

The reconstruction acts and the conduct of the military authorities under them established a new regime; but the resistance of the whites became so effective that the Democrats carried the state for Seymour and Blair in the presidential election of 1868. With that election Professor Ficklen's study ends. The devious ways of factional politics among the Republicans, the intervention of the federal militia, and the period of dual government—these phases of Louisiana history which furnish such lurid chapters in the history of reconstruction remain undeveloped. The unfortunate death of the author in 1907 stopped his researches of ten years' duration. It is to be hoped that another competent student will complete the unfinished work. WM. K. BOYD.

THE HISTORY OF THE CONFEDERATE WAR, ITS CAUSES AND ITS CONDUCT;
A NARRATIVE AND CRITICAL HISTORY. By George Carey Eggleston.
New York: Sturgis and Walton, 1910—2 vols., 433 and 369 pp.

To the great drama of 1861-1865 another work has been contributed. Its author has some of the qualities requisite to a successful historian of the civil war. He is a southerner, who participated in the conflict. His literary activities have helped to give a clearness of style and a sense of perspective rarely equalled among writers on sectional issues. Also, he is a nationalist; he believes that the present state of the nation is better than if secession had been accomplished. Consequently these volumes have a

clearness of diction and a sense of proportion that are unusual in southern histories of the war. There are, however, certain limitations which keep them from reaching the high water mark of masterly historical writing.

First of these is a feeling somewhat too nationalistic toward the motives which led the southern people into the conflict. Mr. Eggleston states that they believed "the god of battles awards victory, not to the strong but the righteous. They were sentimentalists. They believed that ideas rather than facts ruled the world and its affairs. They had been nurtured on the Bible and Scott's novels, and they believed in both." Such an estimate of the temper of the southern people is at least unexpected when the author has skill in treating political controversies and shows a taste for constitutional law in defending the title of his work. Nor is the following characterization of the southern radicals of 1860 entirely just: "As for the extremists, they anticipated military commissions and political preferment for themselves, and they cared for little else than to occupy a conspicuous place in public attention for a little while. . . . They wanted war for the sake of what war might bring to them of advantage, and they were ready to stake everything upon the hazard of their own fortunes."

Another defect of the work is a failure to understand political issues and methods. Thus the only motive behind the firing on Fort Sumter, according to the author, was the desire of South Carolina to force Virginia into secession. Tennessee's adoption of an ordinance of secession is declared to have been "quite regular in form". The South is credited with a "practically united people" throughout the war, while the "fire in the rear" of Lincoln is attributed more to friendship for the southern cause than to other influences. The economic conditions in the South and the political methods of the Confederacy are almost entirely neglected.

Evidently, Mr. Eggleston's work is primarily a military study. Perspective demands that the military writer or critic should follow the line of attack of the invader and show some appreciation of his general plans. But Mr. Eggleston minimizes the "pepper box" strategy of attacking the Confederacy on the coast, in Virginia, and the west simultaneously. The early conflicts in the

west are described with better success than those in the east. This emphasis on the west is wise, for there the genius of Grant was discovered, but all readers will not agree with the depreciation of Halleck or be satisfied to see the death of Albert Sidney Johnston noted without comment on the probable relation of his loss to the results at Shiloh. In the description of the earlier eastern movements some phases of Jackson's Valley Campaign are not thoroughly explained, while the events from the Seven Days Battle to Lee's First Invasion of Maryland are rather meagrely sketched. In the later movements of the war the battle of Gettysburg and the strategy which led to it are hardly described with the completeness they deserve, while the self-evident "where-fore" of inactivity after the conflict remains an unanswered question to the author. Another general criticism is that some important events are omitted while minor ones are included. Thus the surrender of Johnston to Sherman is not described, although the scene of their last skirmish is mentioned. There is also a tendency to introduce platitudes and criticisms of men based on personal feeling rather than facts. Finally, in neither volume is there a map, a serious defect in any history which emphasizes military events.

W. K. B.

WORK-ACCIDENTS AND THE LAW. By Crystal Eastman. The Pittsburgh Survey, edited by Paul Underwood Kellogg. New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1910,—xvi., 345 pp.

This volume of the Pittsburgh Survey, published under the auspices of the Russell Sage Foundation, is a noteworthy contribution to an understanding of the work-accident problem. The Pittsburgh "Steel District" with its 250,000 wage-earners is one of our busiest centers of industry. A concrete study of the accidents in such a community, therefore, affords a representative and practical exposition of this important problem as it exists today in American industrial life.

Miss Eastman's investigation could scarcely have been better timed. It furnishes a body of facts which will be of the utmost service to those who are engaged in constructive efforts to forward the cause of industrial justice. Part I of the book presents a large amount of specific information as to the causes of typical work-accidents in the railroad, mining, steel, and miscellaneous indus-

tries. Part II treats of the economic cost of work-accidents. The conclusion reached is "that the inevitable economic loss resulting from these accidents rests in the great majority of cases almost altogether upon the workmen injured or the dependents of those killed, and that this burden is disastrous to the welfare of their families." The question of "employers' liability" in its legal and other aspects is considered in Part III. Numerous appendices provide helpful information with regard to safety provisions in the United States Steel Corporation, the accident relief plans of the Steel Corporation and with regard to the other subjects pertinent to such an investigation.

The work has been admirably done and is worthy of all praise. Special attention should be called to the many and excellent illustrations of the workers and of the conditions under which they are employed. These with the narrative of specific work-accidents make the book a splendid human document. Twenty-one plates illustrate devices and provisions adopted by the United States Steel Corporation for the protection of its employees. Miss Eastman's book ought to make a powerful appeal to the captains of industry who desire to do justice to those who serve in the rank and file.

W. H. G.

INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL SCIENCE. A TREATISE ON THE ORIGIN, NATURE, FUNCTIONS, AND ORGANIZATION OF THE STATE. By James Wilford Garner. New York: American Book Company, 1910,—616 pp.

Professor Garner modestly presents his work to the public as an elementary text book in political science. It is, however, so comprehensive and thorough going in character as to deserve higher rank than the ordinary elementary treatise. Everywhere there is evidence of a wide acquaintance with the literature of political theory and of a balanced judgement in presenting the views which seem to him most tenable. Indeed, the work appears to be better adapted to the use of somewhat advanced students than to that of beginners. The latter would perhaps be confused by the variety of views set forth in many of the chapters. The extended bibliography at the beginning of each chapter and the bibliographical information contained in the footnotes will be of much service

both to teachers and students. Professor Garner's book deserves warm commendation as a substantial contribution to the study of political science in America. It is an example of the excellent work now being done in many departments of study by scholars of southern origin.

W. H. G.



